Exclusively Distributed by

MUNSHIRAM MANOHARLAL
PUBLISHERS PVT. LTD.
54, RANI JHANSI ROAD, NEW DELHI-110055

First Indian Edition 1978
Originally published in 1938
by Methuen & Co. Ltd., London

PUBLISHED BY ORIENTAL BOOKS REPRINT CORPORATION,
54 RANI JHANSI ROAD, NEW DELHI-110055 AND PRINTED
BY MEHRA OFFSET PRESS, DELHI-110006

TO

THE BELOVED DISCIPLE

'. . . as the Blessed One's own son . . .'
'who like me kept the supreme Wheel of Dharma rolling'.
'. . . as a mother is he . . .'

MAJJHIMA-NIKĀYA; SUTTA-NIPĀTA

PREFACE

I HAVE written this book at the suggestion of my friend Edmond Holmes, author of *The Creed of Buddha*, *The Headquarters of Reality*, &c. He has had the great kindness to read through the MS., and advise me and criticize. This service I gratefully acknowledge. If in part I have not carried out that advice, my gratitude to him is in no way thereby diminished.

C. A. F. R. D.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INDIA THE MOTHER OF BUDDHISM

IT was only about a century and a half ago that England and Europe began to use the word Buddhism (= Buddha-lore) as a name for the religion nominally professed in countries of southern, south-eastern and eastern Asia. Trade and treaties were opening up some of these countries in new ways to us, and we came to learn that, in this religion, the name was derived from a man whom the adherents best knew by the name of Buddha, that is, enlightened, wise, wake, or by the linguistic derivatives of that name, *e.g.* Bukkyo, Fo. A man of China will call the religion *Fo-chiao* ; a man of Japan will call it *Bukkyo-shin* ; but men of Siam, Burma and Ceylon will call it, they tell me, *sāsnā-Buddha*, *Buddha-bhāsā* and *Buddhâ-gămé*, respectively.

Indian literature down to medieval times spoke of adherents to Buddhism as Shākyas, that is, men of the cult of the Sakyas or Sakkas, the northern clan to which the Founder and many first disciples belonged. They then spoke of them as Bauddhas, or Buddha-men, but the Founder retained the name of Shākya-muni, sage or prophet of the Sakyans.

Now whereas, save in a very limited area of east and north India, Buddhism has died out of India for nearly seven centuries, the testimony yielded by epi-

graphy, archaeology and the palm-leaf manuscripts of Ceylon and Burma combine to show that the present 'Buddhist' countries are, as to this cult, the daughters of the Indian cult of the 'Shākyas' of ancient India. It was there, in the valley of the Ganges, early in the sixth century B.C. (or late in the previous century), that the world-religion associated, not at the time, but a few centuries later, with the name of Buddha was born.

But so changed are these daughters of the changed skies, one and all, from the original Indian mother, in the various forms in which they have grown up, that had the first Sakyans slept till now and were now to visit Buddhist countries, they would not recognize their own teaching. This is a hardy thing to say, and Buddhists, especially those of South Asia, will contest it, so are they believing that they at least have handed down the original teaching in its 'pristine purity'. But herein their own scriptures do not support them. In the fact of changing there is nothing here that is singular. Indeed, that 'everything is ever changing' is a prime tenet in Buddhism as it now is. But such have been the circumstances in Buddhist change, that the real original teaching is perhaps harder to find than it is in other world-religions. Travellers and writers have shown how much present-day Buddhism is changed here and there from the relatively primary cult in the earliest scriptures of it which we yet possess. But the changes do not end there. It has yet to be understood how far these early scriptures—both those in a relatively early literary diction called Pali, and those in a later kind of Sanskrit—differ from fragments of yet earlier teaching,

left in, but not repeated and emphasized, as are the orthodox formulas, which we come upon mainly in the Pali books.

Just what do I mean?

In these fragments we come upon—

(*a*) sayings of, or in, agreement with the religion of cultured North India as taught in the day when 'Buddhism' was born;

(*b*) suggestions of a new expansion, not against, but in that religion. But in the main body of the older Buddhist scriptures we find a growing dissent from both (*a*) and (*b*).

This preponderant 'anti'-emphasis has given rise, owing to the very partial way in which men are yet conversant with those scriptures, to a belief that, from the first, 'Buddhism' was wholly protestant and antagonistic to the accepted Indian religion of its birth-time. Many books have been written 'about Buddhism' based on this partial conversance. And much support has come from the prevailing ignorance, in Buddhist countries, of the great mass of the Sayings known as Suttas (in Sanskrit, Sūtras), hardly any portions of which till now have been made accessible to the general reader by translations into the various vernaculars. It is difficult to meet in Buddhist clergy, *i.e.* monks, with a familiarity with the contents of canonical scripture comparable with that of practically every Christian priest or minister with Christian canonical scripture. I have once met such a man—he was of Burma—and have heard of a few others. On the other hand, I have frequently encountered a curious unfamiliarity with much of the Pali Canon, even though there is everywhere in the monasteries a knowledge of

Pali. There appears to be a conversance with certain formulas, certain rules, certain 'suttas' and a few poems, but not more. I shall be glad to find this is no more the truth.

But a great movement is now afoot in most Buddhist countries (except Siam and Ceylon) to get the Pali scriptures translated into their languages and published. Burma has led the way and accomplished a portion; the states of South-East Asia: Laos, Cambodia, Tonking, are showing similar eagerness, and Japanese scholars 'are now engaged', one of them writes, 'upon the translation of the Chinese Tripitaka (or Canon) into Japanese'. Public illiteracy (which is a slowly vanishing feature generally), the great bulk of the scriptures, the consequent cost of translated volumes and the time required to read will combine to retard the effect of this movement. But one day that effect will surely be very great, even as was, in Europe, the eventual effect of corresponding translations of the Christian scriptures.

However, I am not so optimistic as to think that a mere reading of translated scriptures in the mass is of itself sufficient to give an adequate knowledge of 'Buddhism'. That reading will make a man familiar with what the monastic editors at different times *have come to make* of the dimly remembered half-forgotten mandates handed down through the ages. If he wishes to get down to those mandates, if he would seek to dig up what the first Sakyans probably did teach, he must do more than skim through Rule after Rule, Sutta after Sutta, poem after poem, catechism after catechism. He must say to himself things like this: 'The oft-repeated, the formula, is not, as such, that which is

the most true, the most ancient.' And : 'The man who starts what became a world-religion :—what kind of New Word, speaking generally, is he most *likely* to have brought to men ?' And : 'These teachings which don't somehow harmonize with the much repeated sayings : how did they get put in ?' He must say all this to himself mindful of Rudyard Kipling's poignant lines :

He that hath a gospel whereby heaven is won
(Carpenter, or Cameleer, or Māyā's dreaming son),
Many swords shall pierce him, mingling blood with gall,
But his own disciple shall wound him worst of all!

It is to help the reader who gets so far as to ask these questions, and him also who does not yet ask them, that I have written yet one more book. He will see, or he should see, that in these pages he is not likely to get a treatment following and, in its brevity, summarizing the treatment followed by other writers' books on the same subject. This little book is more of the nature of a break-away from lines taken by others. In these it is the formulas which are made the framework of the treatment ; the *clichés* are made important. Here both are put aside, because my readers and I are seeking what was there before they came on the scene.

My task has been :

(1) to make clear the special phase in Indian religion which may be shown as having been the mother of primitive Buddhism ;

(2) to make clear the new expansion in that religion taught in primitive Buddhism ;

(3) to make clear what were the changes in values,

with their causes, which led to that new expansion taking a special line of actual expansion, along which Buddhism took shape in the two main divergent forms, as which we hear it spoken of to-day.

CHAPTER II

HOW INDIA NEEDED BUDDHISM

THE earliest documents in which we can trace the nature of Indian religion are, I need hardly say, first, the Vedic hymns, hymns of the Rig, Soma and Yajur Vedas ; after that, the books of ritual called Brāhmaṇas ; later still, the oldest dozen or so of the 108 short collections called the Upanishads. These dozen are a little prior to or, in part, contemporary with, the day of the founders of Buddhism. They are long prior, in compilation, to the compilation of the Pali collections of Buddhist teachings. But as compilations (I cannot say writings ; they were not written till modern times), edited and included in a closed Canon, as they now are, I judge that they contain many glosses, due to changed values, even to Buddhist influence. To find this suggestion plausible, the reader must compare the changing values in the latest of the 'dozen' with the Pali scriptures.

Now there runs through these three literatures : Vedas, Brāhmaṇas, Upanishads, a quite wonderful evolution in religious ideas. In the Vedas man is believing in and worshipping Deity as certain external personal powers disposing of the material world and the destinies of mankind. In the Brāhmaṇas these personal gods have retired into the background. The central figure is the celebrant ; the man building his altar

with a manifold of measurings, sacrificing, and sanctioning all with the Word. It is this work or 'karma' at the altar which avails. He is shown as guiding, influencing his own destiny, anticipating his Luck. It is his mandating in certain fixed ways the powers that be which counts, more than the divine fiat itself. He rises to the position of one who compels the efficacy of the rite. He becomes *constrainer of the Unseen.*

And it is as having mind (*manas*, measuring) that he becomes compeller. In and with mind he seeks the self (we should say 'himself'); to mind he adds speech, breath, eye, ear and work: thus does he express the self and manifest the man.

In the Upanishads, we see the final evolution of this appreciation of manhood. The Man becomes *that who is worshipped.* The personal gods have become emanations of the One impersonal Being Brahman, a word which, whatever it originally meant, stood for prayer, then for the Object of prayer. This was to be sought inwardly, in the very man, the self, one in nature with the Highest. Man had been the 'disposed of', he was then the disposing, he was lastly the disposer. It was a *progressive revelation of a More in man.* And India has never lost sight of this More. The last development was not given in *popular* teachings, but these were taught to the flower of Indian youth, the sons of warriors and of celebrants or Brahmans. Who first uttered this final appreciation of the man we know not. If it had its Messiah, his name has not 'lived for evermore'. It may have been a teacher who in physical charm or in spiritual influence made no lasting impression on his day, as did the Founder of Buddhism. He lived on only in the way he inspired others to teach.

In this new mandate there was a subsidence of the man-in-the-mind, which we find in the Brāhmaṇas. Mind and body are more clearly recognized as the instruments only of the man, the self. Thus : 'it is the self that seizes hold of and animates this body' . . . 'it is "with the mind" truly that he sees . . .'[1] And 'he', 'the self', the man is one with Deity conceived as Self (= Ātman). Thus, *e.g.* : 'look at yourself in water . . . *that* is the Self, the immortal, the fearless, that is Brahman . . . *thou* art That'.[2]

This tremendous saying was not to be accepted lightly. The transcendent possibilities in man's nature claimed for him were such, that he was taught 'The Self should be sought after. It should be desired-to-be-understood.'[3] The overcoming of all less worthy desires, the reaching the goal of that supreme quest : —this aim of life seen as a whole, for it was nothing less—was figured as a Way (*marga*) : 'an ancient way touched, found by each man', a way leading to Brahman.

There was, moreover, the open door here to religious ethics. Thus : 'one should reverence the Self alone as dear ; not for love of men are men dear ; for love of the Self are men dear'. For the Self is in and of the other man as well.

Herein and herein alone is the matrix from which proceeded Buddhism. We must put aside the modern Western ideas of God as external to man, and of 'self' as being 'egoistic'. These last two terms have crept into our own religious and ethical ideas within the last two hundred years bearing the meaning of our baser

[1] *Bṛhad : Up.* 1, 5, 3. [2] *Chānd : Up.* 8, 1–3.
[3] *Ib.* ; *Maitri Up.* 6, 8.

self only, and of 'being selfish', that is, regardless of the interests and welfare of others. But there was *nothing of this in the Indian idea, nor was there any atheism.* The self was understood as the inner ideal of what one might, what one ought, to be. It may be clearer to us if, for self, we say 'spirit', and in 'spirit' blend the idea 'Holy Spirit'. 'God', as we say, had as it were 'come to dwell within' the man, worded as Ātman or self. The reader will never understand Indian or Buddhist religion if he lose sight of this. The Christian sees the believer as son of God, by adoption through the Holy Spirit. The Indian sees the believer as God. Both are very great mandates. And in the Christian mystics both tend to merge in one. 'My God is me,' said St. Catherine of Genoa, 'my being is God, not by simple participation, but by a true transformation of my being.'[1] And others could be quoted. But the word of John the Elder: 'Behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us that we should be called the children of God; and such we are' . . . 'Dearests, now are we children of God, and it is not yet made manifest what we shall be . . .' remains the typical attitude of the sincere Christian. In that attitude he has come, perhaps through excessive humility, to revile his humanity, so far is the 'ought to be' from the 'is'. In loathing sin, he has erred in degrading the sinner, potential son of God. But the heir of the Upanishad teaching is never blind to the possibilities nascent in his nature. In exulting therein, he seems to the Christian to lack the humility which keeps ever in view his actual dis-

[1] So Mr. Edmond Holmes has more than once reminded us, *e.g.* in *The Headquarters of Reality*, p. 148.

tance from his potential self. But he never forgets, that the potency is not a gift from That to this, but is of his very nature.

If the reader will quite put away from him our modern depreciation of 'self', and concentrate on the wonderful More revealed to man in both cults, Eastern and Western, he will be the gainer.

Now it was with the matter of those 'possibilities' of development that Buddhism, as an expansion of the Brahmanic teaching, sprang to birth.

CHAPTER III

WHAT BUDDHISM TRIED TO DO

WHEREIN was it that the earlier religious reform—that of God as immanent in man—needed expansion? I find it in five ways.

(1) In that 'God-in-Man' we are mainly confronted by two extremes: the Actual and the Ideal, namely, by Man as he actually is, and by God conceived as the essence of perfection in man. We have the top of the scale of humanity and we have the bottom. We have Being as it is, and Being as it might be. On the one hand we have a 'so far'; on the other we have a Most, a Highest, a Best. But there is no clear gospel of the Man as in a More, a Higher, a Better. We have a supreme Goal; we have Man as having set out for that Goal. But that he is travelling towards it, and how he should be travelling towards That is nowhere brought to the front. What is Man, as A and Z, as Alpha and as Omega, doing, as being also the intervening letters of life's alphabet?

(2) In it we see no emphatic guidance for the God-in-Man as being just here and now in the harness of a limited body and mind. What sort of life should result from this Immanence? To what does it next lead? We find scarcely anything about this; we hear only to what It ultimately leads. How is the Potential to be made Actual?

(3) In it we do not find each man taught as willing, as deciding this very How for himself. The student, save in one unique Upanishad,[1] is being passively guided.

(4) In it, when man is declared dear to man because of the common Divine Selfhood, we do not find that which is involved in this made clear, namely, that each man is bound to ward and cherish each, because of That Who in both is most precious.

(5) In it we find the great solution, namely, that the Actual and the Ideal are in nature One, guessed at, felt after, but we also find herein a faltering, a letting go, and another way of attainment put in place of what was felt after. This way was called Yoga. The solution of ' Becoming-by-Living ' gave way to ' Effort-to-unite-with '. The dawning vision, of Man as becoming rather than as being, faded.

I shall now the better be able to show how, in this fivefold weakness, the first clear call of Buddhism sought to expand, to remedy, to buttress.

And first, let it be kept in view, that then, for the first time in India man *as one in a company* was taking his gospel in both hands out from the School, the Few, the Intelligentsia, to the Market, the Many, the Everyman. He was no more addressing himself to the student of the sheltered life and the ' long, long thoughts ' of youth. He was come to talk with the man at the plough, with the mother in the home, with folk for whom death lay nearer and realities mattered much. The folk were waiting for him and they taught him much. What was it that he in a corporate way tried to teach them?

[1] The *Katha*.

This : that man was to spend himself on heeding and reducing the 'More' which stretched between him and the 'Most'. He was to work at making the potential in his nature the actual. *We* have these two terms from the Greek. India had no such terms then to conjure withal. In a way she developed much later one (inverted) equivalent in '*shakti*'. At that earlier date she had to word this gospel without them. We see her using, instead, her great word 'become'; the verb *bhū*, in its many forms. Especially the causative form : 'make become', rarely used till early Buddhism brought it to the front. Buddhism taught that man's nature is not so much a being as a becoming, a coming to be, yes, and a making to become.

Now this idea India, as I said under (5), had been feeling after. The use of *bhū*-words in the early Upanishads shows a startling increase over the use of them in those earlier literatures. The reader will not get this, as he should, out of translations, because translators have too often rendered the *bhū*-words by words for 'being', 'happening' and the like. This is probably because we have mainly dropped our own great Saxon words for becoming. Dr. R. E. Hume's translation [1] is at least a great improvement in mainly rendering the *bhū*-words by 'become' forms. The Upanishads went boldly to the logical results of their 'theory' (so far as it can, inchoate as it was, be called a 'theory'). If man was in nature divine, if man was by nature becoming, then becoming must belong to the nature of Deity. Yes, they said, creation is a becoming ; when Brahman, the Self created, it was

[1] *Thirteen Principal Upanishads.*

a desire to become a More. Then we ask is Deity imperfect, that 'He' should so desire? No, they said, He was not yet (in this or that way) 'become!'[1] We see that we must get a properly adequate notion of becoming. A creative masterpiece in art is a becoming, or process of having come-to-be in the artist, but it is not an effort to become less imperfect, to become 'better'; it was a becoming other, becoming a new manifold. India got this idea later on in words, and spoke of creation as a 'play', a 'sport', of the Creator. But in the field of religion, becoming, for man as yet only potential, is a lessening his imperfection, is the attaining of a better. The way for him lies through a More towards a Most. Limited here and now he has to outgrow his limitations. The divine shoot in him has to be 'made to expand'.

Herein lay the message of the Buddhist teachers at the start. They were needed, for, as I said (5), the Brahman teaching had faltered. Becoming, growth in a More, failed to be adequately understood. 'Growth in things material, the body, the plant, was a thing involving a sequent decay. It could not therefore be truly an attribute of Deity, the main word for Whom had been Imperishable (*akshăra*). Surely Deity must be Being, not Becoming. Becoming was the work of Mind, rather than of very nature. The early notion of God creating by a fiery energy (*tapas*) was chilled, and God as creative Thought replaced it.' This led soon after to those visions of the world as Illusion, which we so much associate with Indian thought. Not mighty toil, but bliss was Deity's true attribute, and so the triad of qualities in Deity: Being, Thought,

[1] *Bṛhad: Up.* 1, 4, 11–14.

Bliss, which are still the Hindu creed, began to emerge. It was a strange and tragic thing, that Indian thought, which had so raised the nature of man, should have confused this, his spiritual immaterial nature, with the other and material nature of his visible instrument the body. Indian thought had, in those early Upanishad teachers, spoken of the very man discarding his decaying part, as the snake sloughs its skin, himself surviving in an undecaying adolescence. It was not they who faltered, but the later voices we hear reflected in the following Upanishads.

Buddhism faltered also, following the Brahmanic precedent. Some three centuries after the first Buddhist teachers we find the analogy of material 'becoming' as followed inevitably by material decay, put forward in debate to contest the older theory, that 'Man survives because of his Becoming'. But at first, it was the nascent Buddhism which took up the drooping torch of the teachers of the Few and told the Many, that for every man life was neither a 'being', nor a 'not being', but a becoming. These are words we actually find in the teaching, but the main fashion of telling it was to liken life to a Way, a Road, a Path.

We may, at seeing this, wonder that this figure, and not that of a plant, a perennial plant, such as a tree, should have been made the central symbol. The tree loses periodically its outward instruments of growth, but at its heart grows on for a relatively very long time. And it may be, the growth of the plant was never far from the first teachings. Man in his true nature: 'what is of You', ('is the very You', we might say) they are said to have likened to the wood, as compared with the underwood and fallen boughs,

borne thence for burning. Nay, it seems to have been the stages of growth in a pond of lilies or lotus which inspired the Founder to put away the mandates he had thought of as gospel, but despaired to get Everyman to listen to, and to take up the idea of growth, that is, of becoming, in men.

But in fact the Way was the better figure. The tree too comes to decay and fall, as its leaves have fallen. And typically the plant is stationary. As wayfarer the man is ever faring onward in the New, the before-unseen, the widened vista, the transformed horizon, the Goal at way's end, and this too: he wins the growing fitness in himself, the enriching his experience with a fresh manifold. Essentially is the Road the right figure for a teaching of man as in a More, faring towards a Most. The journey is an Adventure; so it was actually taught. The Adventurer needs faith; and faith in Buddhism is a leading desideratum. The end is not yet; it was a way through worlds, the wayfarer being ever the same yet changing, changing as the man of many travels is different from his parochial boyhood; changing because becoming what he was not before.

Here is the very gist of Buddhism. All else is accessory to this. Here is no student-dialectic. Here is practical pointing for the man in the world at grips with life. And the first teacher of it, exploiting in it the simile already vocal in the Brahman schools, became referred to as the 'Teacher of the Way', in a passage still apparently unknown to the majority of the Buddhist world. The cousin and loyal attendant of Gotama the Founder, Ānanda, when the former had left the earth, was asked by a Brahman, whether the

Order of the Sakyans had any one equal to him? 'Nay', was the reply, 'there is none like him; he made arise a new Way; made us perceive it, declared it; Wayknower was he, Waywitter, Waymaster. They that come after can follow where he led.'[1] His first utterance, as a new teacher to the friends he sought to make his co-workers, was to speak of a Way leading to the Thing Needed (*artha*). His last utterance as he lay dying was on the true Way. And it is he who in the scriptures is shown applying the figure of the Way, both as an adventure and also as involving exercise of will in the wayfarer. Many such talks will he have given; it is pitiful to find only two surviving, so much does the Way, as just an eightfold formula, blot out the vital personal teaching of man to man on the Way as worlds-adventure.

Under the edited rewording, or rewordings of that first Mantra, probably uttered as a skeleton schema for his fellow-workers to apply as they thought fit, I seem to see this new word: 'Fellowman! there is a way by which you seek the uttermost you need in life. Choose not the line of pure self-will; choose not the line of just rules; these will not lead to that goal. Choose the midway between the two: will to wayfare, and to regulate that will. So wayfaring will you finally attain. Way of Becoming is this Middle Way.'

To this central theme there were important adjuncts. Most important are four. Three belong to the loftiest teaching which I have noted as of the Brahmans of

[1] Sāriputta is recorded as also testifying in these words before his Leader.

his own day. One, the fourth, may be said to be his more original contribution.

(1) A warning lest the self, the God-in-man, should be held to reside in or be the body, or the mind. If these the instruments were the Self, man would not be, as often he is, limited, frustrated, ailing. The Self is not any of these, hence are these in no way to be reckoned as That. In other words, the true Becoming (where comes no decay) is in the very man, the spirit, the soul.

(2) In his first public utterance, a wayside word to certain gentlemen, possibly personally known, and their wives, his text was, that it was the Self Who should be sought after. The words 'self', 'man' at that time were equal terms in religion; the self or soul would be called 'man' (*purusha*). Why, the record says, are you consulting me about a woman who has stolen your goods? Were it not better that you sought after the—— If we say 'man', we see the word-play so characteristically Indian. Actually the records have 'self'.[1] The men are said to have assented, and he to have talked to them, teaching them *dharma* (religion). But what he will have said about the quest of the Self is, alas! lost, and has been replaced by a mere little set piece often used, in which the subject is no more mentioned.

I would here warn readers, that other translators have unanimously rendered 'the self' by 'yourselves', thus passing over the connexion with the Upanishadic teaching[2] (it having probably slipped their memory), and reducing the 'text' of the 'sermon', so characteristic of the Indian teaching of that day, to the modern

[1] *Sacred Books of the East*, XIII, p. 116. [2] Cf. above, p. 9.

Western idiom relating to recovery of health or inward stability. And I would add this warning, that writers about Buddhism more often omit the incident than mention it. For me, if here we have the true saying just and only just surviving, we are by it compelled to see, that Gotama was both teaching and expanding the Immanent cult of his day. This too: that if he had here called 'the self' man's true quest, only to go on and deny in the term both God and man's reality, as he is said to have done, we should almost certainly have found his words—such words had been a very bombshell in those days—carefully remembered in the records. The little formula which has been editorially inserted is quite impossible as a sermon to such a text.

(3) Later, as a teacher of standing, he is shown visiting the king of his country, Ko'săla, and hearing both king and queen repeat to him the current Brahman teaching of 'Because the dearest Thing is the Self', with the incorrect corollary, that another is less dear. Gotama is not made to correct them—the later editors were possibly ignorant of the older teaching, *i.e.* of the Brahmans, and have got the story wrong—but he reminds them, that since to each man the Self was most dear, it was up to him not to injure that other man (he being no less the God-in-man). In other words, a man's becoming involves his conduct towards other men. This implication is nowhere brought out in the Upanishads. I see in it the bringing in of a new emphasis.

(4) I come to a yet newer word. That the man was to look within for Deity is not, in those early Upanishads, clearly shown to be more than a very

wonderful blissful fear-dispelling ' knowledge ' of what I am, Thou art. It was a splendid ' state ' of being. For Gotama it was, not so much a ' being That ', as a This that one ought to become. For the static he substituted the dynamic. For the rapt complacency he taught the divine unrest of the inner urge we call ' duty ', ' conscience ', and which India, though not then in religion terms, called *dharma* (that which should be ' borne ', in mind, in heedfulness). ' By the man who longs for the great self, *dharma* is to be reverenced.' *Dharma* thenceforth came in Buddhism to take the prominence of the idea ' self ' in the Brahman teaching. It was as if he had said : It is ' will ' you need in religion more than mind ; ' energy ' more than contemplation. Energy, effort, endeavour : for these he had words, and everywhere do they meet us in the Pali scriptures as they do not in the Upanishads, *e.g.* the man who has set effort on foot (*āraddha-viriyo*). We find also a stronger compound : the ' datum of initiative ' as the very proof of the existence of self in the deed (*ārabbha-dhātu*). This occurs but once ; its survival is one of the wonders in Pali scripture. But a strong word for ' will ' India never had, for effort is way in will, but not will. Will is the man alive, will is man under the aspect of action : action not alone overt, but as mind too, as feeling, for these are both modes of will. So the Buddhist teachers had to make good with great vigour over ' *viriya* ', and with the idiom of their day : ' the walking according to *dharma* '. In these and in the *bhū*-words of becoming lay their dynamic arsenal.

Here the reader may say : I do not find this teaching

of the need of becoming made central in any book about Buddhism, and people who have read many of the Pali translations say they do not find it stressed anywhere. Am I to believe them or you?

As to that, three remarks and two quotations.

(1) The word 'becoming' (*bhava*) had come to be depreciated and, where it seemed necessary, dropped out from the Sayings. I have been showing above how this happened. But there was another reason, and of this I will speak in Chapter VI.

(2) The Way, which I have called 'Way of Becoming', is now universally called, not of becoming, but Eightfold Way (more usually Path). In fact I have found the equivalent 'Way of Growing' left in only in a Commentary! That the list of 'Eight' was an 'amendment' is strongly suggested by the same Saying being repeated with this and other lists used as alternatives.

(3) Translators, anxious to get good current English, tend to avoid using the word becoming, both noun and verb. Moreover in Indian tongues, the future tense of 'become' is the same word as 'will (or shall) be'; the verb 'to be' is defective, and borrows. In such passages our translators always use, have always used, 'will be', not 'will become', just because it's more idiomatically 'English' to do so. To day, the latest Pali Text Society's translations are correcting this inaccuracy, and it will be possible henceforth to find 'becoming' both in text and in quality of work.

Now for two specimens, both overlooked in all the books, of what may, in my judgement, be genuine survivals, even if in them too we must discount some

editorial handling. The rendering is very condensed but literal:

(A) From the Second Collection of Suttas; No. 39, 'Mahā-assa-pura-sutta' (Great Horse-stead Saying).

The Founder is said to be addressing monks at the township so named.

'. . . People know you as being "monks". If you are asked: "Monks! what's that?" admit that you are, but say to yourselves: "We will take up and practise those things which make the monk; thus our profession will become real, our pledge a thing become. And our use of the things we need to live by will become fruitful and profitable, and our leaving the world will become not sterile, but fertile and full of result." You should train yourselves thus.

'Now what are "those things"? Train yourselves to be conscientious and discreet. You may then think: "We've done that. So far is enough; enough has been done. We've won what we sought as monks. There's nothing further to be done." I declare to you, I protest to you: see there be no decay in your quest while anything further remains to be done! What further remains to be done? Train yourselves saying: "Very pure will we become in conduct of deed, word, thought. We will neither exalt the self nor despise the other man." Then you may say: "We've done this as well", and rest content. I declare . . . I protest . . .'

And so it goes on step by step in the Way in the Better.

Now in the translation of this Collection,[1] excellent in so many ways, the reader will not find the word 'become' once used! Yet the whole Sutta is a fervent teaching in a Becoming that finds no climax here on earth. Before it is over the aspirant develops the gift of converse with the Unseen and becomes as

[1] *Further Dialogues of the Buddha*, by Lord Chalmers. *S. Bks. of the Buddhists*, vol. V.

one who is a man of the 'two houses': this world and beyond. It is true, that it would be possible, wherever 'will become' occurs, to substitute 'will be', in so far as the word in the original would be exactly the same (*bhavissa-*). If we do so, it will be due to a double shortsightedness: we shall be ignorant of the way in which the teaching just preceding that of Gotama had been constantly making use of the idea of becoming, and so predisposing his teaching to adopt it; we shall be ignoring the way in which we have ourselves made our language, our thought the poorer by dropping our strong middle-English word for 'becoming': *wurthen, wairthan, weorthan,* and making shift with the weaker term 'becoming', an ambiguous word at the best. We have of course the more Latin forms 'develop', 'evolve', and we have the hefty term 'grow'—a word, by the way, used in Pali exegesis to equate with 'become'. Let translators then use these if they will, but let them not be ever falling back on 'be' for 'become'.

I could, had I space, show this gospel of the growth of soul in other passages. Thus we have the two characteristic terms: 'a man-as-he-ought-to-become' (*bhāvanīyo*), and 'bound-to-become' (*bhabbo*), occurring in the Sayings. It was not, as it is so much with us, a question of the growth of body and mind; it was a teaching of the very man, the man-in-man, growing, becoming. Now this was in that age a New Word.

(B) Just an outline of the Sutta in the Fourth Collection, Book of the Fives No. 180, called 'Gavēsin, the Seeker'.

'Long ago', the Founder is said to have told his

cousin and attendant Ānanda, 'there lived a follower of an ancient teacher, a man we may call Seeker, whose example many followed. But he was not content with the way of his own life. "This", he said, "is a levelling of levels, leaving no whit of a More. Come now, I'm for something more". So he set himself a high code of morals, and confessed this to his imitators. And they followed him.' The same urge of discontent is repeated, with a becoming in further stages in the good life. 'Wherefore', is the final word, 'train yourselves in this way: Striving from further to further, from good to good, let us realize the liberation beyond which naught remains.' To which let me add these lines from another Saying in the same section: 'And in him reflecting thereon the Way comes into being, and that Way he follows, makes become, makes more . . .'

Now am I bound to become one turning no more back;
I shall become a Further-Farer in the life divine.

CHAPTER IV

WHAT BUDDHISM DID

I HAVE pointed out the line of expansion which the Founder of Buddhism apparently sought to make in the religious thought of his day: the line of man's need and will to become in the More that lay between him and the Most that he potentially is, a line symbolized by wayfaring in a Way, a Way of Becoming. I have also pointed out certain important accessory teachings aiding that wayfaring. I now ask, do we, when we study the scriptures and external history of Buddhism, find that it expanded along that main line?

My reply is: Expansion came; a very notable expansion in Indian religious thought. But that expansion being a resultant not of one, but of several combined forces, Buddhism emerged along something which, as compared with the main line indicated above, was, if not a side-issue, one that had at best a shortened vista. Thus the expansion was not nearly what it might have been, had the central message been better understood, had that central message not had to contend with strong 'vested interests', had there not been certain potent growths in thought and in conduct already in the field. These growths contributed to distract the Indian public from that in the new religious ideal of Immanence in which expansion

was needed. Actually the Buddhist expansion was the giving birth to a social, an ethical development of high worth, in one feature indeed a development of a worth the world has yet to realize and practise. There was born a child of its own ; there was adopted another's child. But it neglected the stronger qualities of its own child, and wasted the strength of the adopted child. What do I mean ?

What was Buddhism's own babe ? I have called this a high ethical development. I have not called it the introduction of a moral code. Yet I have heard Buddhism credited with this, so dangerous may a little learning be. We know a little better now, and if the false credit still sticks, Buddhists have themselves largely to blame for it, in that they, in their scriptures and their rites, overstress a feature in their teaching which was not original, and neglect the nobler side, the development in that feature which at its birth was new.

To explain : there is immense repetition of a five-fold negatively worded code of fundamental morals, known as *sīla*, or (moral) habit, and which came much later to be called the 'five sīlas' (to-day *pan-sil*). This negative mode is not just the 'not' of the Christian adopted Jewish code : 'thou shalt not . . .' ; it is in the word 'aversion from' (*veramanī*). And there is more than one way of wording the framework. The fullest is : 'The training in aversion from . . . I undertake. But the personal vow is oftener than not omitted. The first three are never varied : 'from onslaught on creatures' (often freely rendered as 'from taking life') ; 'from taking the not given', under which all theft is understood ; 'from (sexually) immoral conduct'. (This betrays monkish editing, in

that it, literally rendered, enjoins celibacy.) The fifth: 'from places of wanton use of wine, spirits and strong drink' is a later addition; it does not occur in the whole of the Moral Habit Section, which includes the first thirteen Suttantas of the First Collection, and may have proved necessary when, with the growth of the Order of Monks, many men of slender moral qualifications, as compared with the earliest missioners, were ordained. It is, in the First Collection and elsewhere, replaced by an extension of the fourth: 'from lying speech', namely, by three other vices of speech: slander, abuse, gossip or chatter. The fuller code adds five others: 'aversion from' eating at wrong hours, indulging in amusements, adornments, easeful couches, and the use of money: rules evidently framed for the monastic life alone.

As to the more generally valid first list, we are at once struck, if we are not Buddhists, by the curious omission of filial duty. In the only code in the Upanishads of four moral items one half is taken up with this:

'Become one-who-has-the-mother-as-divine, the father as divine, the teacher as divine, the guest as divine:' such is one teacher's injunction to his pupils of the academy.[1]

And we find this taken over into one Pali Sutta, but teacher and guest are omitted, the parents being justly called 'the first teachers', and *therefore* worthy of reverence. Clearly the monkish outlook has been busy here, with its vista of the cloister with home duties cut out.

[1] *Taittirīya Up.*, ranked as about fourth in those deemed earliest. The compound is *mātṛdevo bhava* !

But throughout that Moral Habit Section, and in one or two other contexts, we come upon a greater, higher moral attitude than that of aversion from the immoral, and one which carries virtually into effect and expands the Brahmanic view of seeing the divine Self in the other man also. In it the not taking life is supplemented by the good man as eschewing force and cherishing compassion and goodwill (*hita*) for all beings. In it the not taking by force or stealth is supplemented by contentment and clean hands. In it not to lie, slander, or abuse is supplemented by truth-speaking, peacemaking, gentle and worthy speech. It is true that the third on sex relations is left in its monastic inadequacy. India's honour of the mother is old, but it did not impress the monk editor. Elsewhere, only, and not in the code, we find the monk enjoined to look upon every woman as sister or mother, and the husband enjoined to treat the wife with respect, courtesy, faithfulness and trust.

But it remains a curious thing, that with much ambition to adopt modern moral ideals and to claim them as already in their ancient faith, Buddhists are content to make parade on so many occasions with this very inadequate *pan-sil* in its negative form only, and not make it worthier from their own scripture.

No, Buddhism did not introduce a moral code into the land and place of its birth ; its new word lay, first in clothing that land's moral code in a worthy positive form, showing moral law not merely as a veto for the immoral doer, but also as a guide for the man willing to do well. But it went further. For it, the moral life raised to this higher power was for every man the Way of Becoming, in his wayfaring in the More towards

the Most. By it morals were taken up into religion. As morally earnest and sincere, a man passed acquitted through the tribunal awaiting us at the threshold of the next world. Through moral carelessness, or wantonness, a man was there arraigned and for that sent to prison, to 'purgatory'. By shaping his life according to moral ideals here, he fitted himself to share in the 'companionship'[1] of worthy devas hereafter, in a further stage of the Way.

But we have more here than just a heightened, quickened moral law. Let the reader note, that the positive supplement to the *first* item of the moral code, in that Moral Habits Section, is more distinctive than the other supplements. It reads: 'he having laid aside the rod, the sword (of force and "might"), lives ashamed (to hurt), endued with kindness, friendly and compassionate for all breathing living things'. This supplement, and this alone, might be called a very world-gospel in itself. As such we might have expected to find it in the utterances recorded as those with which the Founder began his teaching. It does not; the word 'compassion' only occurs in the first charge to missioners on tour, and tours presuppose at least a year or two of nearer mission work. What are we to conclude?

This: that it was in Amity (*mettā*) and its kindred sentiments that the actual expansion in Indian religion was made by Buddhism. It will be remembered that, in the fivefold weakness[2] of the Upanishadic teaching of its great theory of Immanence, the fourth was called

[1] This is more correct than the 'union' of the English and German translations.

[2] Above, p. 13.

the failure to exploit the implication lying in the statement, that the divine Self in man being 'dear', every other man is also dear to him who so feels. Now it was not as a conscious application of this sentiment that amity between man and man was taught, nor was it taught as an essential way of 'becoming More in wayfaring toward the Most'. Not in this conscious clear-sighted way do gospels spread. But actually this was mainly the way by which expansion in Becoming came to India and the Eastern world through Buddhism.

It will be new to most readers to hear, that, as against the thirty-three references to the 'friend' in the Old Testament of the Hebrews, there is in all the early Upanishads but one instance of a word for 'friend': 'favouritism to friends', and that, be it noted, in sayings probably not pre-Buddhistic, viz. the Maitri. The god Mitra, the 'friendly', shadowy double of Varŭṇa, is here invoked in passing, as well as in the older Taittirīya, but not as a live note in religion. Were ṭhere yet born that child in embryo, a Concordance of the Pali scriptures, I could set a startling figure over against this; even Indexes show us seventy references to friend and friendship *in one of the books alone.* That silence does not, of course, mean that the relation of friend was not as old, in India as elsewhere, as is human society itself. But the absence of 'friend', of 'amity', from religious literature is none the less significant. It means, that this relation had not entered as a factor into religion, that is, into man's quest of a More on his way to a Most.

Through Buddhism this relation did enter as a factor into religious values. And our conclusion should be,

that man found a Becoming in the Way just as and how it was then most needed, even if, in so doing, he did not place it on record as 'according to plan'. A faked set of records would certainly have been more superficially consistent. In the outline which is all that the First Utterance originally was, we should have, in such records, a placing of Amity within the Way. Were the Eight Factors that are now in the Way there originally, and not as an afterthought, when they already formed a fixed independent category, they would have included Amity. It was not there; it is not there. It was, for original Buddhism, the very Wayfaring itself.

What of that special feature in this ethical development, which I have called an adopted child? (p. 27)

In the earlier, that is, the Pali Buddhist scriptures we come several times upon a formula as distinctive, as 'undated', as eternally ideal as anything in the whole of religious literature. This is known, in later Pali, as the fourfold God-abiding, or Brahma-vihāra. This name is not late, but at first it is applied only to Mettā, and that is the first in the four. Thus:

> *Ay, amity for all the world, even*
> *the mind immeasurable let him make-become!*
> *. . . let him this inner wareness keep:*
> *'God!' have they here this biding called.*
> (Brahmam etam vihāram āhu.)

The formula bids the man take into contemplation successively the four quarters of the earth, and 'suffuse' them with thought 'accompanied by' (1) amity, (2) pity, (3) joy, (4) balance or poise, and void of all enmity and illwill, 'even in all ways, by wholeness, as having all'.

It is to be regretted that the formula is occupied with these large fetches only. They are more impressive, but in a later manual we find the suffusing being taught as what one man should practise *on another man*, whom he judges is needing a richer store of what he lacks. The universal business is with practical sagacity put into the background. Again, we note how the word 'will' is absent just where it is needed. We should now call the four 'exercises in televolition': will exercised at a distance. So understood, we see here a really wonderful ethical ideal, in which the best of us are but babes. But we have not yet rightly grasped it as gospel, but have supposed (in the absence of the word 'will', and in the universal terms of the formula), that we have here only a sort of sublime sentimentality.[1]

But whether considered only as such, or more intelligently grasped, Buddhists have claimed this fourfold ideal, chiefly only the first two of the four, as an original part of their Founder's teaching.

I have called it not that, but a teaching he adopted. My reasons for this, given fully elsewhere,[2] are (1) its appearance as an Appendix at the end of a collection of 'discourses' all giving a full scheme of doctrine, when it should have found place in that scheme throughout; (2) its association with Brahman religious aspiration in many passages; (3) disciples professing it as gospel asking the Founder's disciples if they taught it *in their way*, or differently? (4) it is omitted from a list of doctrines said to have been a final charge uttered by the dying founder; (5) it is not associated

[1] So H. Oldenberg.

[2] *Sakya, or Origins of Buddhism*, ch. XI; *Manual*, ch. X.

with any eminent disciple, in the List of those who weie pronounced supreme in this or that culture.

It is not unreasonable to hold, that the names, the memories of some of man's great Helpers man has let die. My own hypothesis about the Helper in this ethical televolition is, that he was a Brahman teacher in the schools who discerned, more than some, that Making-to-Become-in-the-More which the new cult of Immanence so needed. This he will have taught. And then there came a day when inspiration from the Unseen entered into him : ' Cease to teach these youths. Go forth to the fellowman. Speak to him of amity, of pity. . . . Make him with surcharged manas (mind) suffuse his fellowman with the amity growing in him, drench him with it as with a perfume. Send him this as you would wish to be urged wherein you are inert ; send it as goods to one who lacks ; send it in the wish to help him. Send it to the self, the very-man (*sa-ppurusha*) in this man, that woman.' This meant probably a great upheaval, an encountering of shocked, perhaps sneering colleagues, the becoming a homeless ' almsman '. But he obeyed and ventured. His teaching lives on. His name is treasured in better worlds than this.

That he met that other great Helper Gotama is more than doubtful. That the disciples met we do find. The adoption of the four Brahman abidings may have followed on the decease of this Brahman, before that of Gotama. The life of the latter will have been a noble example of his own gospel :—a perpetual Becoming in a More ; and this teaching he will have clearly seen to make for that More. Much, I have said, will he have learnt, both from those he taught

and also from those who with him were helping man.

The little poem from which I have quoted—it is in two anthologies and called Metta-Sutta—ends on a lofty note, and is for me a very linking up of Immanence with original Buddhism. Namely, in man's active amity to man it sees that More by which he may *become* Very God. Even the Commentary calls 'Brahman' the Best; and what is the 'Most', the Highest but the Best?

I do not translate Mettā by 'love', as we translators sometimes do. Mettā was not that spiritual devotion which in India arose after the rise of Buddhism and was and is known as Bhakti, or which we find in the Christian Gospels in the word Agapé. These are more intense, more profound; they are mainly a passion for a Divine Object. As to where love includes the fellowman, we have it in the New Testament in richer manifold than anything associated with *mettā*. There is nothing in the Buddhist scriptures to match the loving warding of man by man, whereby after death his fate before the tribunal of the Son of Man is determined. Nor is there any description of *mettā* which comes anywhere near the rich beauty of Paul's letter on *agapé*, or 'charity'. Yet we may not forget, that in the Metta-sutta, *mettā* is likened to mother-love, or this, that it was this great adopted gospel of *mettā* which, in the course of centuries, emerges in Asoka's own testimony to his hospitals and other good works, and to appreciations of some forms of benevolence occurring in the Pali scriptures.

None the less *mettā*, as compared with 'love', is a very temperate relation, which has given us no David

and Jonathan episode in Buddhism, nor even provoked the sentiment: 'There is a friend that sticketh closer than a brother.' It had monastic teachers as a vehicle, and in these it was but natural, that where every human relation save those of teacher-pupil and disciple-disciple had been cut off, the semi-starved human nature should find a great treasure in friendship, and give word to it, but with monkish restraint.

Concerning the other three forms of televolition: pity, joy, poise, I will here add but a word. It is clear from text and exegesis that these came in importance a good way behind 'amity', the first. Pity (*karuṇā*) came to higher worth with the growth in the cult of Supermen that we find in Mahayana Buddhism. We find this peeping out in one of the 'apocryphal' books of the Pali scriptures. Joy (*muditā*) is traditionally understood in the sense of the German term 'Mitfreude', or sympathetic joy, gladness at another's good fortune. But the tradition shows depreciation in understanding this third 'vihāra' as merely a 'thought of felicitation'. The original idea was to fill the unseen object, suffering from 'Schaden-freude', or malicious joy, with the willer's own wealth of the opposite. Lastly, in poise, the tradition again shows a worsening, in that the practice of poise is represented as a self-antidote to any excess of exercise in the first three. So lamentable was the decadence in tradition, even where, in expounding the willing of amity from individual to individual, late exegesis has, in a priceless survival, revealed to us the real object of the forgotten founder of this gospel, namely, of man as, by sheer will, a helper of the fellowman!

There is yet another great word, the exploiting of

which was mainly the work of Buddhism. It does not appear hailed as new, yet it is not found in the Upanishads. The nearest to it is *dayā* or *dayada*, kindness, and in the Pali, the two appear sometimes together. I refer to *anukampā*, which I render by ' compassion '. It does not coincide with pity, but is the greater sentiment of being ' moved '[1] with tenderness for the fellowman, pity being the mode of it wherein the compassion becomes, if inert, unbearable. ' Compassion and kindness ' as the good teacher's motives is a saying ascribed to the Founder. Compassion strikes a no less lovely note in the Buddhist scriptures than does *mettā*, or *dayā*, and in a precious, because too rare form of surviving discourse, a talk to a layman (not to monks), it is enjoined in unexpected ways, *e.g.* the wife should feel compassion for the husband.

As to the word kindness, this occurs just once in the Upanishads in a unique passed-over context, associating kindness with the legendary ' angels ' Asuras. This word is a corruption of the Persian word for God ; moreover, kindness is a feature in ancient Persian religion. It may conceivably be a seed dropped in India from contact of a kind with Persia, which, remaining sterile in Indian religion, came somehow to life in Buddhism.

There is one more word in the quiver of such arrows : the word *hĭta*. This once meant ' what is fit ', hence the derived meaning ' worth having ', or as we should say, ' what is good for '. It is never absent when man is shown concerned with the needs of the fellowman. When, for instance, mission tours were begun with the spread of the movement, the charge is ' Make a tour

[1] Anu-kamp- ; *vibrate continuously*, or *because of* (*κατα*).

for the weal, the good (*hita*), the happiness of the Many-folk, out of compassion for devas and men '.

It is in this one aspect of man's great task in actualizing what he might become :—the expansion of his relation to the fellowman—that I see the way taken by the Buddhist. It was indeed a noteworthy mode in man's Becoming ; it was not more. He did not clearly grasp himself as one-needing-to-become, and as *in essence becoming*. He never lost sight of the need of ' making-become ' this and that in thought and conduct. But that the Becoming *was the Way towards becoming ' That '* :—here he fell away.

CHAPTER V

GOTAMA, THE 'BUDDHA'

AROUND a date reckoned in the East to have been 630 B.C., in the West, 550 B.C., there was born to Suddhôdăna, a raja of the provinces (that is as if we said, to a 'laird'), in the kingdom of Kôsālă (that is, in the present Nepal and also, may be, further eastward), a son whom he named Siddhartha, his own family name being Gotama, his clan, the Sakyans. With the many legends that grew up down the centuries about his childhood and early manhood this outline cannot deal. It would only obscure our subject 'Buddhism', obscure it much more than would a treatment of Christian legends about Jesus Christ obscure an outline of Christianity. In both cases the legends are about the Man ; but in the latter faith the Man is living on and working ; in the former the Man, save in Far-Eastern developments, lives on as Man no more. In the latter the Man and the religion cannot be separated ; in the former, the religion, whether in its original or its later forms, is the thing ; its worth is independent of the person of its Teacher.

This son was evidently no ordinary young squire. His father may have been chief of a province of sub-rajas' domains or estates ; the post may have been hereditary, and hence serious duties of administration

may have lain before him in the future. Indeed, we read of him seated as a boy by his father when the raja was acting as magistrate, and learning secular 'dharma', or law. Nothing here is authenticated, but the legends agree in showing him much worried over things about which mankind may worry, but which it takes in its stride resignedly: things which belong to life as known and fairly predictable, and for which as they come it seeks no special miraculous exemption: old age, illness, death. It is therefore not impossible that the Sakyan clan, and may be others, were ravaged previously by some visitation: famine, raid, epidemic: ordeals under which men cry out in revolting anguish at the way in which the bearable processes of nature had been rendered unbearable. There is no evidence of any such disaster in the legends, well as India knew all the forms named. But on the one hand, the preoccupation of the Founder with life's *normal* decay seems to need some such clue; on the other, we may reflect that the much more recent religious reformation in a worsened Buddhism in medieval Japan, set on foot by Honen:—that of Amida and the Pure Land, or 'Jodo',—was provoked by the miseries following civil wars, inclining a distraught people to long for a hereafter.

Even if his preoccupation with the triad, old age, &c., was not so provoked, these are by no means worthy or fit to be the fulcrum and the lever of a great world-gospel. And the fact that they have been so held worth and fit suggests, that the real Moving Idea in that gospel has been lost to view. Buddhism has too much harped on them, and on the goal as being the 'ending of ill (*dukkha*)', ill being either just these, or

'craving', which is only blameable as leading to recurrence of these:

> *Like forest fires behold them drawing nigh:*
> *Disease, decay and death, dread trinity!*

'I tell you, sire, I make known to you: old age and death come rolling in upon you: what is there that you can do?' [1]

We are not told, save in one legend, that the young Gotama found a solution to life's 'native' ills before he left home, to study and inquire where he might better find human thought busy about big questions than he could in his upland home. It is not impossible, that, whether some emergency or cataclysm had exaggerated them or not, he was worrying about just that threefold decay of the body, and nothing higher, when he left. But that he was led to base a great spiritual mandate about man's spiritual nature on three normal facts of man's bodily earth-life is for me nothing short of a libel on a leading saint of India. It is only a phase of the way in which Buddhism has belied and belittled the 'very-man' as India never did. 'Woe is me', he is recorded as saying, 'at the world's evil pass in its births and ageings and dyings! Is there no way out?' But that he was content to frame a remedy to just these is to do such a man less than justice. His real gospel made no allusion to these three words at all. *It was so much more*; it was concerned, not with the body, not with the mind; it was concerned with the Health, the Becoming utterly Well of the man himself, whose tools these are. Himself in a great Becoming, he did not bide bending over

[1] *Theragāthā, and Kosala-Saṃyutta.*

the crutch, the sick-bed, the grave. He wayfared further.

The legend just referred to throws an interesting, yet unheeded, light on this. In the well-known drives, where the young noble returns worrying over the threefold ill of the body, he is said on a fourth drive, to see a monk, *lit* : one who has gone forth (from the world). The driver explains what a monk is. The stock scriptural way in this is to say, that he, disgusted with worldly life, then donned the monkish gear, forswore all worldly lure and sought to realize, or realized, that for him ' life has been lived, all that could be done is done, and henceforth there is no more " suchness " (such as life offers) '. The driver's definition is startlingly different : ' Leaving the world is good conduct according to *dharma*, good conduct according to steadfastness, good deeds according to merit and excellence, good in not harming, good in compassion for beings.'

This description is much more in terms of the good laylife in the Pali records. Why is there nothing monkish about it? Why nothing as prescription against ' Ill ' of body? Why have critics done nothing to solve this problem in evidence? I suggest this : the three drives, resembling the three messengers in the Sayings, may be a true legend ; the monk episode is a gloss put in to show value in the monk. The definition of the monk, befitting the good life in monk and layman, shows the gloss to be earlier than the other class of definition quoted, this having been drawn up when the cleavage had grown sharper.

I pass over the six years alleged to have been spent in ' wanderyears ' of studentship, sampling teachers at

the progressive town of Vesālī and elsewhere, sampling in particular two ways much in vogue, of seeking supernormal light and leading. These were (*a*) *jhāna*, and (*b*) ascetic practices : the former (*a*), often mistranslated as 'meditation', was the attempt, by solitude and silence, to bring the whole man, body, mind, spirit, into an intense listening alertness of an emptied, a purified receptivity, wherein there might be developed psychic gifts in hearing, seeing, thought-reading and more ; the latter (*b*), much in vogue among the Jains, was a new movement of a religio-ethical tendency, located chiefly at Vesālī, and teaching *inter alia* that man could, in *tapas*, or voluntary bodily privations, cancel the pleasant errors in his past deeds (*karma*).

We find Gotama, dissatisfied with the teachers of the one method and with the asceticism as such of the other, leaving certain sympathetic friends and following an urge to work out things alone. With this episode is linked the legend of his tree, and crises undergone beneath it, more fit to be affecting a less worthy character than such as was he. We find him leaving the tree with the design of teaching a dual scheme or gospel, and worried at the thought, that it is not such as would appeal to the Many—a plan to teach renunciation of earthly joys, and cause and effect in all things. These were subjects much engaging men's thoughts in the religious ferment of the day. The worry was reducing him to a decision to give up troubling himself over the greater welfare of men. He then, being what we now call a psychic, was aware of a presence and a voice. By both he was entreated to bring a message to men through which,

where then they were 'worsening', they might 'become'.[1] To him pondering the vision, came the thought—it may have been the sight—of lotuses as *growing* in the water at different stages of growth, beneath, level with, above the surface. Men were like that: they were growing; it was their nature to grow. But not just like plants only.

And then we find him setting out to find men to help him teach, not that dual plan, but a gospel of growth, of becoming, by a figure more fit for man and his life as a whole than was that of a plant. We come to the Mantra of the Way, of becoming as a Willed work, as a wayfaring in an ever more growing towards that (who was the man-made-perfect, the man-'fulfilled', Deity).

So far we have found Gotama, but not 'Buddha'. Tradition assigns him, till he built the scheme which he rejects, the title Bodhisatta: wisdom-being; thereafter, the title 'Buddha': wise man, more literally, awakened one. This, a title but not a name, may be compared with Messiah, Christos, the Prophet; and probably only came into use more than a century after Gotama's death. Why do I say this? (1) In the first two Councils, held respectively just after, and a century after, his death, he is spoken of only as the Bhagavan (the Worthy One, a very usual title of respect) and the Teacher (Satthar), but not as 'Buddha'. (2) In the scriptures, he is addressed or referred to by both adherents and outsiders as Gotama, and by the former as Bhagavan, as Tathāgata and sometimes as Sugata (the latter couple: 'So-

[1] This contrast in terms has been quite overlooked. Cf. my *Manual*, p. 131 f.

going' and 'Well-going', were evidently 'Way-names', applied to all adherents of the Way gospel, and *only later reserved* for the quasi-deified teacher of the Way). (3) In the scriptures he is alluded to as Buddha *in formulas*, such as the triad 'Buddha, Dhamma, Sangha', and the Fame-Word (*kitti-sadda*) describing him as bringing with supernormal gifts a method of training men, and also as just 'one looked for'. Such allusions bear the stamp of a Buddha cult, a popular creation of the after-time. (4) Once, in a Saying, he is said to call himself 'Buddha'. But this (coming just after a Saying in which 'the good man' is called '*buddha*') is probably the word 'clean': *suddha*, altered to suit the cult, so strongly does the context require the word 'clean'. 'Just as the lotus's glossy petals retain no dirt, remaining clean, so am I, not stuck to by the world, clean (*suddha*)'.

Of his first public utterances I have spoken. We have but a fragment of each, surviving in a setting of a marked monastic stamp, and as such, unfitted to stand as New Words for every man and woman :— the message they purport to have been. There is here no space to reproduce even the fragments, much less the settings ; but the reader of translation or text should test the records by this hallmark of a world gospel. Let him especially note the 'setting' in the opening of the first utterance, where the great Word of the man choosing his Way towards his ultimate goal is applied to the monk, the *pabbajita*, alone ! And further, that his choice in wayfaring is shown not solely as a clear call to *man*, but as something that has all been well understood already by the Teacher. Let him, in the appended paragraphs, couched in curious,

sometimes scholastic phrases, note only, that the word 'make-become' is reserved for the Way: *maggaṃ bhāveti*. *This* is the literal English, but translators have hidden it. The linking of the two words is profoundly significant

Let him further note, in the second utterance, the warning as I have called it above, that the words: 'body is not the self; mind is not the self' cannot rationally be said to imply that there is no self (or soul, or real 'man'). As soon might I be held to be denying the existence of the captain, if I said on looking at two sailors 'You are not the skipper'. Yet this is just the inference that Buddhism has come to draw from this monition! This belongs to the after-history.

Let him further note how the formulas in those first utterances may be found in misfitting contexts. Thus in one Sutta the 'Eightfold Way' is said to relieve mother and son of the anguish of being parted. Here the Way as 'eightfold' is meaningless. But if, for 'eightfold', we read 'Way of Becoming in the Worlds', then may thereby the meeting of mother and son become a fact. The 'Eightfold' has shortened vision.

There is yet a fourth early utterance, known as the 'sermon on burning'. This, addressed to new religieux converts, is naturally concerned with monk-cult and cannot be called a new word of catholic importance.

Of the long mission-career of Gotama we have some sketchy features of great interest in the first division, called Vi'năya, or Discipline. This is an assorted catalogue of very many Rules, with the occasions of their being made. It begins with an old general code [1]

[1] Pātimokkha: 'what should be kept in view'.

of the then rising Indian monasticism, and is followed by the special rules of the Sakyan Order. Lastly, there comes that which, had the new 'church' remained a Community for Every man, and not mainly for the monk, would have been put first. This is called the two Khandhakas, or portions, greater and less, being the opening episodes of the mission, to which are added (*a*) more lists of rules with occasions, and the incoming of women members or nuns, and (*b*) records of the first two councils.

In the first we see Gotama in solitude going over what is a drafted formula of the rising of misery or ill conceived as so many spiritual emergencies in a causal series. We see him resting from travail of mind in what is termed 'happiness of release'; then exchanging opinions with a Brahman also concerned with sincerity in religion, but who has, as a later result of Buddhist divergence from established religion, been oddly burlesqued by editors. We come to the moving Hesitation scene, in which Buddhists and others have lost sight of (*a*) the changed theme, (*b*) the allusions to Becoming and to Growth; and then to the search for fellow-workers and the first utterance: that on the choosing of the Way-in-becoming to the goal 'Artha'.

Gotama's wish was to persuade his teachers in 'Jhāna' to join him, but learns by clairaudience that both are deceased. He then persuades five friends (it may be others) to come in with him. These are named and have their legend; they are also made to appear just converts and monks They were probably not truly either, but fellow-missioners and as yet laymen. The Vinaya, its chief care the setting forth

the prestige of monkhood, would start with them as monks at the first step, but this is not genuine ‘ history ’. We have, it is true, the dispatch of missioners on tour in twos, as cited above, coming after the first sixty ‘ converts ’ are enrolled. But there is seen no effort anywhere to narrate events in actual serial order of happening. And it is scarcely possible that ‘ tours ’ would be called for, till the little nucleus had made a definite impression at and around Benares, where the first utterance is located. My own opinion is, that tours did not get set on foot till the fellowship had been in existence about a couple of years, and that it was only then, when the touring made work for livelihood impracticable, that the missioners formed themselves into an ‘ order ’ of almsmen, depending almost entirely for the necessities of life upon the people’s usage of showing alms-hospitality to ‘ holy men ’.

It will have first been necessary for the Founder to earn for himself a status as what was called *arahan* :—a man of outstanding will in exerting influence over other men—as well as for his co-missioners to be known as able teachers. The man who appears to have given him first effective credentials was the already accredited fire-worshipper, Kassăpă, with his two brothers and their followers. I still hold it likely we have in Kassăpă, the Kangran Ghachah of Persian literature, a Brahman who went, it may be as a noble’s chaplain, to Persia, and there became a follower of the Zoroastrian cult. Fire would be for him as much a central symbol of his faith as was the Way for the Sakyans. The Vinaya has a quaint and evidently corrupt series of episodes concerning the relations between him and Gotama, made to appear, through

the zeal of the Buddha-worshipper, as so many competitions for supremacy in magical powers :—a quite unworthy piece of editing. But that the Kassăpă brothers came in with the Sakyans, and that the eldest recommended the Sakyan leader to Bimbisāra, king of Magadha, the land just east of Benares, is a more plausible tradition. The king, it would seem, gave him a 'bamboo grove' for residence near the capital, Rājagaha, and therewith other material support.

We come next to the support given by gifted young Brahmans, who will have seen in Gotama one who, in teaching their own new ideal of Immanence, revived in it that new word on Becoming, which was losing credit among the Brahman schools. Little, among the discrepancies in the scriptures, is so marked as is (*a*) the respect in which Gotama is shown finding among various Brahmans, and (*b*) the gibing and satirical tone we see in the references to Brahmans and Brahman teaching generally. The most notable of these supporters were two Brahmans who became famous as his chief disciples, Sāriputta (or son of the lady Sārī), his own name being Upatissa, and Moggallāna, his own name being Koliya. These two, who it is said were seeking salvation as *amrita*, the Immortal, were not teachers but students and left the sophist Sañjăya to join the Sakyans. *Amrita* was an Upanishadic ideal, and they were therefore seeking new light on the way thereto. But when they are brought to Gotama by Assaji, one of the first five to join, we read of no new light on Amrita, but of a new gospel, not of the Way, *but of causation.* The account is a quaintly corrupted jumble, and may be a fusion of two new gospels : the one that of Gotama, the other, the line he forsook, but

which may well have been attracting Assaji and other reformers of the day.

Of these two great helpers, Moggallāna was an outstanding psychic, and is listed in the 'famous men' as best in *iddhi*, or will-power, literally, 'effectuating'; Sāriputta was the better teacher and is listed as the best in *paññā*, or wisdom. This term, which is our wisdom 'at a very high power', was, in the Brahman religion, the man expressing the God within him, as distinct from work of intellect or mind. We may say of these two that the one wrought, the other taught, but that the latter lived what he taught as much as he spoke it; and, of the 'Master', that he will have been an exceptional fusion of the two powers.

This is not to say, that Gotama was an eloquent speaker. Many and long indeed are the 'discourses', the 'dialogues', the 'sermons' he is made to say. On the other hand, (*a*) we find him famous as a lover of silence, (*b*) we find him sitting with his disciples in utter silence, (*c*) we meet with short, pithy sayings, pointed, abrupt, fiery, which do not bear the stamp of the edited, the inserted; (*d*) he not seldom refuses to answer at all. It may well be, he was all things to all men, and his was a mission of many years in which to be the one or the other as such. But the man as needing to be a More-in-Becoming was, in his new word, *man in the life*, so much more than man as talked about in words, that it is for me likely, that he taught far more by example 'of godly living' than by words.

Other leading disciples who were Brahmans were the man reckoned senior to all in the company: Kondañya, Sāriputta's brothers Chunda and Re'văta, Kacchāna and Koṭṭhĭta, intellectually able, Puṇṇa of

Mantānîs, an eloquent speaker, and probably the Purna who deliberately took his gospel to where he expected and won a missionary's death, and another Kassăpă (it was a common Brahman name), the double in externals of the Founder, and an incorrigible ascetic recluse.

Besides these, there was the Sakyan contingent who joined him after his repute was established, coming from his home Kapĭlavatthu, mostly kinsmen: Ānanda, the loyal cousin, Anuruddha, also a noted psychic, Mahānāma, Bhagu, and last but not least, Devadatta, gifted, psychic and, as schismatic, the cause of sore trouble to his kinsman.

Other notable but shadowy figures there were among the first men: Kappĭna the raja, a teacher of whom we would fain know more and an echo of whom survives in Sanskrit literature; Gavam'păti and Panthăka, who appear as men of psychic power in the Elders' Anthology and elsewhere, and Rāhula, the only son of Gotama, who followed his father, when the latter visited his own people, who appears in Sayings as fostered in Becoming by the father, who has gained an unenviable repute for lying in the Asokan Edicts, and silence about whom at the father's death can only mean his own previous decease, or secession from the Order.

Of women-members there is little space here to speak, but the woman's movement, apparent in both the early Upanishads and the Pali scriptures, is of marked interest. The legacy of it in the Sisters' Anthology is in all literature a unique work. So too, differently, is the Commentary on the nuns' rules in the Vinaya. Woman will ever be to the fore where new ground is being broken; she is only conservative in defending the New. And the gospel of a Becoming

More will have made a special appeal to her, whose central function is the 'making a more to become'. The mother, ran the Upanishadic saying, 'must be made-become (cherished), since she is making to become'. Women tried to enter the Order before the conditions were such that they could be decently housed. The Founder's refusal, before consent was possible, has been crudely misrepresented in a way very unworthy of a man like Gotama, and betraying the smear of the monk-hand. Thus the Founder is made, in refusing thrice and then yielding, to say, that women would be in the Order as burglars in the weakened homestead, like blight in the corn, and would shorten the effective duration of the true religion by one half! Woman has proved a better friend to the religious cult than it to her.

Last Tour and Death

The long devoted mission-life of Gotama, extending to not far short of half a century, was not marked by any critical episodes, save that of Devadatta's attempted schism. But then we have no chronicle of it except the early fragments referred to. We would give much to learn more of those years of vigour, twenty or thirty, when he and his men were now applying the teaching of the Way of becoming as a matter of living, not of rite and ritual, now secluded in Jhāna-listening, now and always revealing by amity, kindliness, concord and joyousness,[1] an example of the More in life that they saw in it. But we only know where and with whom he was by the terse openings of countless Suttas or

[1] In one Sutta the king of Kosala speaks of the repute of the first disciples as eminent for these features.

talks. Now these are with the king of his own country, Kosala, now with friendly and appreciative Brahmans, now with such as were less friendly, now with merchant patrons, now with the wise and beneficent lady patron Visākhā, now the table-guest of a great courtezan, now greeting the lowly 'flower-sweeper', now, according to Commentaries, seeking the little child, now at the sick man's bedside.

But perhaps in getting a little light on his tremendous vigour and zest, we may think too carelessly of the long decade or more, when with the enfeebled body, to which there is a pathetic reference, there came to him the loneliness of all his first helpers gone, passed away, like the two chief disciples, or by choice, living apart from him, like Kassăpă, Puṇṇa, Anuruddha; when there also came the wearing uneasiness of seeing the 'new men' in his Order taking the helm, honouring him as a venerable figure-head rather than as any more the Man of the New Word, and drawing up set texts and formulas of which he may actually have disapproved.

Of positive disapproval on his part there is no good evidence. Yet is there a suggestion in verses ascribed to Ānanda, in which he may possibly, for he was anything but an original genius, have been repeating his chief's sayings. Ānanda[1] is bewailing his loss in his great cousin's death:

The men of the olden time are gone;
The new men suit me not at all!
Alone to-day this child doth brood,
Like nesting-bird when rains do fall.

---

[1] The calling of Ānanda 'beloved disciple' is a well-meaning but unbased analogy. Loyal he was, but limited. Sāriputta alone fits the title.

But further, there is the odd feature of his dying alone in the open, when on a tour with Ānanda, a pedestrian effort for which his age was quite unfit. The Pali chronicle, in a quite unusual formula, sketches in the many attendant monks, but the repeated call to Ānanda to come on to the next place is a unique refrain, strongly suggesting that the tourers were but the two old men. And the Tibetan scriptures show them as being alone. The funeral too has a rushed flavour, as of an emergency, about it, Kassăpă, the ascetic survivor of the Old Brigade, hurrying up too late to take the adieux of the old friend and leader he had chosen to leave alone in his last years.

Ancient bas-reliefs and other ways of cloaking any scandal to the Order, that news of a seceding Leader might betray, have combined to smother what, when disentangled, suggests that the old Lion was wrath. I have no wish to invent, but in view of what the after men made of his mandate, it was fit that he, who taught so great a More in the man should, on looking around and ahead, feel wrath.

The Pali 'Book of the great decease' or 'Great book of the decease', as the longest Sutta, or Suttanta, in the 'Long' First Collection is called, is a profoundly interesting field for the historical critic. The true peeps out in it from beneath the changing, which is dominant. It is a great patchwork of excerpts, most of them irrelevant, from other scriptural contexts, combined with a few passages almost or quite unique. Here is a word about four of these.

(1) The dying Founder bequeaths to Ānanda a mandate in which he ends as he began: 'with the Self',—a command to be treasured as precious 'sail-

ing orders'. 'Live ye as they who have the self as a lamp, a refuge; who have *dharma* as a lamp, a refuge, and none other.'

This has been misrepresented in translations with the un-Indian view, that man is to rely on his own human self, not looking any higher:—a meaning impossible, not only in any religion worthy the name, but especially in India—and on a formulated doctrine or scripture, a meaning again which the word only came to bear with the compiling of an oral, then of a written 'Bible'.

(2) The dying Founder names his successor as no man, but as Dharma. This is conceived in the same later way. But the Founder is related as confessing allegiance and reverence to Dharma, when his career began, and he had put forward no doctrine at all! 'Let him who longs for the *Mahattaṃ* the great Self, revere Dharma', runs this repeated passage. To this I have referred.

(3) The dying Founder utters this: 'So living (as above), men will become the Highest-immortal, whoever are willing to learn.'

By a curious quasi-perversity the English translator, for 'become' puts 'reach', the German[1] puts 'be called', without the former's excuse, since the great word *werden*, 'become', was for the latter ready to hand.

(4) The Founder, on leaving Vesālī, as he tours on and before falling mortally sick with dysentery, turns round and looks his farewell, commenting on this to Ānanda. This is a unique gesture. Later a 'Cairn of the Last Look' was reared[2]; there may have been

[1] R. C. Franke. [2] Fā-Hien and Hsüan-Tsang both refer to it.

an escort so far of well-wishers. Now Vesālī was the centre, three centuries later, where Buddhists still upheld the reality of the man or self or soul and his Becoming.

Those conservative Die-hards protested in vain; they were dismissed from the Order, as we shall see. Morals in religion, amity :—to that extent the Order, as we have seen, was carrying on his work. But where is the worth in a Way-gospel when the Wayfarer is ruled out? What is a gospel of Becoming wherein the Man-who-Becomes is taught as a No-Thing? Such thoughts make that last look a haunting memory, a very benediction : *Ave! Moriturus morituros salutat!*

CHAPTER VI

CURRENT THOUGHT AND NEW VOGUES

I HAVE referred to the leading position assigned, in pre-Buddhistic literature, to mind and speech, as man's modes of self-expression. Tempered for a time by the eminence given, in Immanenoe, to the very self, this Indian preoccupation with mind was given a new kind of impetus by the teaching, also pre-Buddhistic, of a man known only as Kapila. But this was not a rehabilitation of mind *in value* ; it was rather the opposite. It was a first attempt to analyse mind, as if it was a material thing or ' happening ', and then to class it with things material, *e.g.* body, as forming together just ' the manifest ', or *prakriti.* As such, mind was quite distinct from the self, or very man, and altogether inferior to him. *He* was the real, positive, immaterial valuer in spiritual things but detached, passive, with respect to *prakriti.* Hence the saying of this school about the latter : ' this is not I, not of me, not for me the self ', which became, with, not distinction, but negation in view, adopted and reiterated by Buddhism after its early days. True, we find it already in the so-called second ' sermon ', but this is for me probably a later insertion in a very hoary oral fragment.

This new and crude psychology, as we might call it, came to be known as Sānkhya : ' computing ', with

'naming' implied, or Paṭisankhāna : 're-computing'. I call it analysis, since that is what, in the old sayings of the Kapila teaching, we find attempted. The inner world of man's activities is set out in categories, much as we have done in our 'knowing, feeling, willing' and the like. *Much later*, a sort of metaphysical system was built on these crude beginnings, but let the reader not mix this up with early Buddhism, nor heed any 'deriving' of the latter from that 'system'.

Nevertheless, the new preoccupation with mind was beginning to be felt at the birth of Buddhism. It was being weighed by Brahman teachers. One of these, Kaushītaki, before Gotama's day, was already with wise prescience warning students against heeding too much the thinking, feeling, doing, and too little the thinker, feeler, doer. Brahman teaching did take heed, and harnessed the new Sānkhya in its culture, as complementary to the discipline of introversive effort called Yoga. Before that, the new, growing interest may be followed in the Upanishads. This is not shown as the advantage *we* think to gain in analysis, namely, a new clearness of knowledge. It is the new richness in mind ; it is the More that was found in opening up its manifold. 'Is there than (just) mind a More? Surely there is more : there is intention . . .' and so on.

The Sānkhyan analysis was appreciated and carried on even further by the early Buddhists. But in their case, from Kaushītaki's warning being unheeded, there came the disastrous effect, of which we ourselves know something :—the analytic habit put Buddhism into harness and drove it to the merging of thinker, feeler and doer in thinking, feeling, doing ; the man was

lost in his instrument. At some time, we know not just when, this instrument and the other, the body, were ' computed ' as five *khandha's* (Sanskrit: *skandha's*) : aggregates—lit; heaps—so the Commentator —first, body, then *vedanā*, or bare experiencing, *saññā*, or recognizing (or perceiving with naming), then *sankhāra's*, or complex-making, then *viññāṇa*, or knowing, awareness. And most Buddhists would now be content to call these ' the (sole) constituents of personality ', a definition which would at the birth of Buddhism have been held to be a fairly daft proposition! I would say again, that the curious pentad occurs in that ' second sermon ', and I say again, it is for me a later insertion. No mention of ' skandhas ' in this use is found in the Upanishads; the man is there split only into name and shape, name being the symbol for the man as not *all* revealed in ' shape ' or form. Here and there in the Pali Sayings we find just ' body and mind ', not *as* the man, but as properties. Nevertheless, the pentad is very dominant in those Sayings, and is a sore drag on the literary directness and force in them.

No claim is ever made in the five to any serial or causal order. And it will be noticed that our terms: intellect, reason, judgement, imagination have no place in the five, nor is that term, supremely valued by both Brahmans and early Buddhists: *paññā* (*prajñā*, wisdom), made a separate ' skandha '. With a certain psychological sagacity ' wisdom ' is classed under the fourth or complex-making ' skandha ', since wisdom is a blend of reflection and intent to act.

But the 5th ' skandha ', *viññāṇa*,[1] has a curious his-

[1] Cf. the manual translated as *Compendium of Philosophy*, Pali Text Soc. ed.

tory. It was used at the birth-time of Buddhism to mean 'the man as surviving', since, after death of the earth-body, he as survivor was in his new body *aware*. Hence the word *viññāṇa* was equivalent to our 'soul'. But the growing tendency to see in the man only a changing congeries led to this use of *viññāṇa*, as implying the man as persisting, as relatively permanent, becoming discredited. It gradually sank into meaning a mere awareness of sensations. Centuries later, as if by a revenge of human reason, *viññāṇa* was partly reinstated in persistence; namely, it became conceived as a mental frame or form, containing this or that property (*chetasika*), and so it is held still, in its synonym *chitta* :—a dead husk representing the living man who reacts, experiences, values.

1. Thought about Causation.

There was another contributing factor, to which I have already referred. This was a current interest in causation, or law of cause and effect, as a constant happening. (It is only we who would now call this a 'natural law'.) This, in the Pali, is worded as scientifically as we might to-day: 'Given this, that becomes; from the arising of this, that arises. This being absent, that does not become; from the stopping of this, that is stopped.' It is not possible to assign the growing preoccupation with this with any man's name, as in Kapila's case. We have only the record associating 'him' with Assaji, and Assaji is shown speaking as only a modest learner. Actually the insistence on causation as constant procedure is allocated to Gotama, and so much has this tradition influenced Buddhists, that causation is sometimes called

the basis of Buddhism. So much came to be fathered upon him!

But it cannot be made out that the growing interest was in what we have called 'natural' causation, or causation in physical nature. With this men were then not interested. There was no such body of knowledge as we now call physical science. We read of some star lore; we read of drugs for simple ailments and even of surgical operations, but the healing art plays a minor part in the old literatures. And of interest in 'science' for its own sake, or for finding truth, there seems to have been none whatever. Man's interest centred in man, and it was the new conviction, that his inner spiritual and mental world, his inner life as expressing his past, present and future—that just these facts, these happenings—went on as orderly procedure, as causes and things caused, which had arisen in some thoughtful man or men of that day, that was coming into Indian culture. The first expression of this is not in Buddhist sayings but in the 'Upanishad of the White Mule'; beginning

'*What is the cause? what Brahma? whence are we sprung? . . .*'

Preceded in this way, but not by a long interval, the first Buddhist teachers doubtless welcomed the new vision as in harmony with the Way-mandate. We even saw that the Founder was disposed to make causation his central note. We can be sure that, if he had done so, he would have exploited the idea of cause as a making-become the More in man, have taught man as a very well-spring of cause. There is a remarkable, much overlooked Saying, which relates how a controversialist asserts before him, that there

is no self-agency, no agency in another. 'Never', is Gotama's reply, 'have I heard of such a theory. You put your foot forward or back :—is there here no initiative? How then can you maintain there is no self-agency?' It is in *the producing*, the *bringing to pass* that he was interested.

But when the after-men drew up a formula of causal process, it was in *stopping* cause that they took interest. The formula, starting with a first cause as unknown, postulates man as the result of condition-complexes, educes, from the datum of the man, contact, sense-apparatus, experiences, craving, grasping (or fuel for rebirth), *becoming*, birth, old age, dying, 'and hence all this mass of misery!' Hence, the right object was the stopping of cause to stop the effect. What a terrible distortion of the bright new vision, in which the earlier teachers will have conceived man as having in himself Godhead as creative, Godhead as not static, but a dynamic spring of productive energy to bring forth a More in his wayfaring!

2. The New Vogue of the Monk

However monkhood began, and it had in India its beginning, it can be seen from the literatures, that as an institution for men of all ages, and not for the aged Brahmans alone, it was a growing vogue, still new when Buddhism arose. The *shrămăṇa* (or monk) occurs *but once* in the early Upanishads. We read of a popular outcry, when the young Brahmans joined Gotama. We read of surprise at its attraction for young men; we read of ridicule incurred by the men of no beards, the 'shaved ones' (this was not necessarily tonsured or bald men at first); we read of the householder's

contempt for the cadging fellows who preferred alms to doing decent work. That the vogue persisted and attained an honoured status we also see, in the second of all the longer discourses, wherein the Kosalan king admits he would honour as monk a man who had been his slave. (It is claimed that this discourse was recited as early as at the First Council, but as to that a similar claim is made for all, some of which are admittedly later compilations !) That the monk won his cause reflects no blame on him, but rather credit. His was the victory of unworldliness, of moral and religious earnestness, of pluck as the minority, of strength of will in an ideal, which the majority might in theory respect, but not find it in them to get out of the groove and follow.

Moreover, the leading spirits did not go to the cloistered life as the refuge and surrender, for which weaker men came to seek it—and this is freely admitted —or for which men of to-day seek it, for whom it is mainly an exotic sanctuary from the battle of life. I believe, that for the founders of Buddhism and their co-workers the business of the missioner was the main preoccupation, and that, effectively to carry on this, it was necessary to give up the life 'of the world' as a tie which would nullify the worth in their work in religion. People would not have listened to the gospel taught by one who was sharing their life. He had to show that that gospel was the one thing in the world which mattered.

Moreover he would need, then as now, to 'come apart and rest' often, and therewith the better to learn, to ponder over, to realize the nature and growth in his own Becoming, and prepare the better to be

teaching it. But I do not see those missioners pinning faith in the retreat and seclusion available in the monastic life as the chief means for ' working out their own salvation '. Had this been the case, they would never have founded the nucleus of a world-gospel among the people. The latter idea came in later, when the cenobitic *Shramaṇa* became an established institution. And it was then, that I see what I call 'the Arahan theory' developing: the theory, namely, which is well borne out by certain formulas and contexts, of saintly consummation of the Man, who has here already, or at least here all but, achieved human perfection, having done what was to be done, lived life, was utterly ' free ' and for whom had arisen the conviction, that nothing more of this ' suchness ' was in store for him. With that theory came the shifting in meaning of the word ' nibbana ' (nirvana), from the ' waning out ', in Becoming, of the lower nature, to signify the mystical otherness-in-being of the deceased ' arahan '. As meaning a merging into Deity we find it in the Sanskrit poem Bhagavadgītā, but not in Pali books. The formulas convince me, that we have in this theory a teaching of which the first men knew nothing. Not only because formulas betray, as such, an after-growth, but because, had the earlier Buddhists held that this perfection on earth was attainable, they would not have shown it as realized by an intuitive conviction. With men of great psychic gifts at hand in the Founders, they could have learnt from other-world communication whether a man qualifying for ' arahanship ' had here ' done ' everything, or whether yet one or more lives in some better world were needed.

I see in Indian monasticism of ancient and medieval

times three stages. That monasticism has a history, else should we not find the word *shramaṇa* only just emerging in the older Upanishads. Now these reveal a wonderful uplifting in the idea of man's spiritual nature: '*Thou* art Thát', as has been shown above. We do not at this distance of time allow for the effect of this on some earnest natures, and hence we incline to see the Indian monastic leaning as un-dateable. Always must we reckon-in that love of the Alone, which is not an Indian monopoly, but which is likelier to thrive in warmer climates. Given this and the earnest thoughtful nature combined, the new Immanence cult may have proved to such so wondrous, that here too was a matter over which it was an urge to 'come apart' and to taste it in solitude. We find lingering in the Pali books a word for such meditators: *Brahma-bhūto*: 'one who has become God'. Here I see the earliest stage in the growth of a *shramaṇa*-world. That we can trace it thus far does not mean we are at the beginning of such specially Indian growths as almsgiving and asceticism. These are much older than that of the *shramaṇa*, whether we render this by 'recluse' or by 'monk'.

The second stage in monasticism is that of the swift growth just before and after the birth of Buddhism. The third is the stage we meet with in the Pali books. Men were becoming monks for various reasons: debt, fear of justice, the shirking having to work for keep, &c. The worthier motive is called 'from faith', or 'confidence'. This, as we may infer from the 'refrains' about it, was that in release from all ties, all interest in gratifying sense, a man might speed up his becoming qualified to win the state of 'arahan', and so the

quicker end his being involved in recurrence of life, which as he knew it or pictured it, seemed to him, in this or in any world, a thing of 'ill'. With this intensely self-interested outlook there grew up, in the much abused world he had left, the belief, without which he had been sorely hindered, namely, that his life 'thus consecrated' (the term is not Indian) became for his kin, his world, if they supported him, a source of 'merit' (*puñña*), to them, as guaranteeing a testimonial in ordeals awaiting them hereafter.

That the modern Indian *sannyāsin* and *sādhu*, terms which have replaced *shramaṇa*, are showing a revulsion to the ideals of the second stage named above, belongs to our own epoch, but is none the less interesting for that. The 'release from ties' so much in view in Indian monasticism as *môksha*,[1] or *mukti*, Pali *mutti*, or rather *vimutti*, was for early Buddhism not a monopoly of monasticism. A gospel of Becoming is clearly a widening, an expanding of limitations, a climbing, as it were, to the heights, a metaphor which we find very finely used. But that other, that lower release from not only the lure, but the duties of life in the world, tended to bulk largely in this new vogue, and is at times brought in with unabashed candour. A movement evidently afoot among women in particular, for worthier social status, shows itself in the way some nuns sing about 'liberty' in their new life.

The reader should bear this in mind when meeting with terms for 'release' in translations from the Pali, namely, that in this much-saying word more than one kind of emancipation is merged. In as far as it meant a spiritual More in man's Becoming we may see in it

[1] This term is not so old as the Vedas.

a term of the first men. But the same word served to justify that divergent gospel in the Less-in-man on to which Buddhism declined. It was when the reality of the very man was coming to be doubted : it was when the notion of Godhead as static being was assailed by the growing conviction, that nothing was permanent, that the Divine man was, not so much becoming, but merely an ever-changing congeries—it was *then*, that monasticism in India became a very doctrine of man-in-the-Less.

With the slow but certain growth of some little knowledge in religious history, there is growing a tendency to deny, that Buddhism denied the real existence of the spiritual man, the soul, and to say there was only denial of soul as a permanently identical persisting entity. As an unqualified assertion this is not true. First, the Divine Self, conceived as eternally permanent *in*, was denied *of* the human self ; then the human self was held as not to be got at save in mental happenings ; finally, in and before the fifth century A.D., the human self was held as not to be found in any feature of body or of mind, because he was just non-entity.

Salvation is there, not the man who's saved,
Doing is there, but not the doer,
The Way there is, but not a goer !

Here is no question of a permitted qualified human self or soul ; here is pure nihilism. And no cult of that kind could long persist in India without dishonour and discredit. It is always possible that in a future Buddhist reformation these medieval prophets may be posthumously stoned, and a rational reform con-

cerning the man: valuer, willer, wayfarer, arise in Buddhism. But till that day dawns, India will never take Buddhism back, unless indeed India also tramples on and denies the very man.

The threefold slogan of monasticism which took shape we know not precisely when, included this 'not-self: *anattā*, but leaves us uncertain, in the way it is spoken of, how far at first (*a*) a growing dissent from Brahman teaching was meant; (*b*) the very self as not in or of body and mind was meant;[1] (*c*) how utter denial of the reality of the very self was meant.

The other two terms are 'impermanence', or transience: *aniccha* (Sanskrit: *anitya*) and 'ill' (*dukkha*, a word as comprehensive as that old English word). The first two find expression in the latest of the 'early' Upanishads. 'Impermanence' will have meant a reaction from the sweeping reform, which bade men look within for God, relegating the personalized powers of life and destiny to a shadowy background. How could man be imperishable, permanent stable Deity? The very term 'unchanging', not found before, begins to appear.[2] The notion too of thought as momentary (*khaṇika*) happenings followed after.

The other term 'ill' was the word in which monasticism summed up its outlook on the world, on life there, or in any world. A sincere conviction doubtless in the new movement towards world-forsaking, it will have been less so, when, with the growth of the movement, Indian society began to be cleft into the workaday world on the one hand, and on the other into clubs of men of all ages living as monks in

[1] The warning in the Second Utterance.

[2] In the *Bhagavad-Gītā*.

cenobitic communities, and depending on that working world for the necessities of life. The world as Ill must have been a flag it was essential to keep wagging, until the cleavage became accepted as a matter of 'things as they are'. When that happened, it is noticeable that, whereas 'ill', with 'change', sank into abeyance save as a formula, the 'not-self' came to the front :—do we not see this in the late *Questions of King Milinda*?—and has since remained, in South Asian Buddhism, as it is often called, 'the central tenet of Buddhism'.

It is true that a fourfold formula called the Four Ariyan (i.e. worthy, or noble) Truths is often also called central. These, suggestive, so European and late Sanskrit exegesists (but not Buddhists) pointed out, of a doctor's diagnosis : (1) nature of ill, (2) cause of it, (3) aim in treatment, (4) method (or 'way') of treatment, figure largely in Pali literature early and late, and have been appended to the first Utterance,—that on the Way. And it is likely, in agreement with what I have said, that the Truths formula, with its *chief subject*—not the Way, but Ill—will have been drafted, with the growth of the world-forsaking vogue, during the second and third centuries of the Buddhist movement.

I would not assign it an earlier date, certainly not, as formula, give it a place in the Benares Way-mantra. There is a List of lists of doctrines said to have been enjoined on the Order in one of the last addresses, on that last tour, by the Leader. In these lists is no mention of just this list of the Truths. And in a book of Sayings dealing with each list, the four truths *are appended* as if come later to birth.

Now it should be plain, that this obsession with 'worlds' and 'lives' as 'ill' must have militated immensely against the first teaching, that Becoming in the very man or soul or self was by way of the opportunities afforded by 'worlds' and 'lives'. These did not cease to be held as facts, past and to come. But they were not plural forms in Indian idiom. In the 'world' were many 'dwellings' (*nivāsā*), it was said, and 'life' was just 'becoming'. But in monastic terms, both words came to be called 'becomings' (*bhavā*); and it is in this sense that we find the word *bhava*, really *bhavā*, so vilified in a number of compound terms. It is no wonder that readers get mystified.

Karma

It should be clear that, as the central teaching of the Founders of Buddhism is here understood, conduct, *i.e.* human karma, or the proof and expression of a man's Becoming, was of first importance. But, as the name for a matter occupying religious teachers of their time, we must look rather to the Jains as mainly responsible for it. Its prominence in the Pali scriptures is relatively small. That a man's deeds affected his fate hereafter: this we see, in the earliest Upanishad, as a topic of interest, requiring private consideration before it could be adopted in the teaching curriculum. The Jains taught, that by voluntary acts, a man might modify his future 'becoming' by cancelling his past acts, *i.e.* the results of them. The first Buddhists saw in actions the index of a man's Becoming; it was Becoming that modified the acts.

Now in these several factors of current interest, inquiry, practice, do I see the main causes of the changing values which we need to discern, if we would rightly estimate the early history of Buddhism.

CHAPTER VII

THE FIRST TEACHERS

NOT nearly enough have writers yet considered, how very much the original teaching of Gotama has been masked by the influences we have been counting up. His teaching was positive and constructive; those influences were to a great extent negative or analytical. Let us leave them, and come back to the Founder and his men. It may be asked, do not these bulky Pali scriptures, or other Buddhist scriptures, give us anything that amounts to a chronicle of the half-century or so of their mission-career, so that we can follow what they did, what they were saying, from year to year?

The answer is, No, nothing that can be taken with confidence as a 'log' of tours and residings, dating back to a time as near to the times of the mission years as, say, the writing down of the synthetic gospels of the New Testament was to the days when Jesus lived on earth. The earliest attempt at such a log dates, in writing, from about the first century B.C., when, according to a chronicle of Ceylon-Buddhism, called *Dīpavaṃsa*, composed about A.D. 300–400, the Piṭakas and the 'Commentary' were first committed to writing, the former being till then 'recited' in a literary diction formed from the Prakrit dialects called Pali, or 'text', the latter being till then recited in

Singhalese, and not recast into Pali till some four to five centuries later, viz. in the fifth century A.D.

The portion of the 'Commentary' in which this attempt was made was that on a little book of the Second Pitaka called *Buddhavaṃsa*, a metric account of twenty-four preceding Buddhas and of Gotama as twenty-fifth. Under the last, the 'Commentary' names nineteen places into which it fits a number of legends about the Founder. In the yet later Tibetan scriptures the whole forty-five years of his life as teacher are accounted for. But before we place confidence in these attempts, we must remember that the Tibetan scriptures are very late books, and that, in all probability, the Commentaries were the free, unfixed talk of expounding teachers till the first century B.C. This makes the openings for changes, getting made in the telling, far more numerous than would be the case in the reciting of the 'text'. It was many years before the 'text' itself got put into fixed prose and verse. The 'text' was at first only the opening sentence or sentences in each remembered Saying. This was called *uddesa*. The following exposition was called the breaking-up, analysis, exposition: *vibhanga, niddesa*. And already a good deal of later editing had gone to bring the Breaking-up into no less a fixed form than that of the Uddesa or 'argument' (as our books used to say). Much more, and much freer editing will have gone into that recast of the 'Commentary' from Singhalese into Pali (which Buddhaghosa is said to have made in Ceylon, *cc.* A.D. 400). In this way the Commentaries are a strange hash of legends, of the late dogmatics of Buddhaghosa's time and of verbal exegesis, or paraphrase of words.

The places named are of interest, for they reveal an orbit of very limited extent, from the junction of Ganges and Jumna westward, to the beginning of the great Ganges-delta eastward, and from the Deccan southward to wherever, in eastern Nepal, Kapilavastu lay northward : perhaps 100 by 130 miles (?) We have nothing credible to show that the first men (excepting the adventurous Purṇa) ever toured farther afield than this radius. Certainly incredible is the Ceylon legend that Gotama ever travelled to Ceylon. It was the so-called Middle Country, as described from east to west above, in which their labours lay :—a name of Brahman origin, first found in Brahman literature, and much discussed by scholars, none of whom has associated the term with the once new teaching of Immanence, in which, for the first time in religion, the Man was taught as in the Upanishads.

We learn more than we can learn from Commentarial legends from the fragments—they are nothing more—surviving in the Vinaya-Pitaka, to which I have referred. We have also, as we have in the Gospels, an account of the first missionizing on tours, following on the alleged charge to disciples. This is valuable as much for what it omits to say as for what is said :

> ' I am freed from all snares human and divine. You are likewise. Make a tour for the welfare, the happiness of the many folk, out of compassion, for the weal, for the good, for the happiness of devas and of men. Go not singly but in pairs. Teach Dharma, lovely in the beginning, the middle, the end (of life) with its meaning and in the letter ; set forth the wholly perfect, very pure God-life. There are persons with eyes but little dust-bedimmed who are perishing, because they hear not Dharma ; some when they learn will become (*i.e.* will grow).' [1]

[1] *Vinaya Texts* (*S.B.E.*, vol. XIII), p. 112.

This is a great word among survivals. But it does not take us far. It reveals the new company as having decided to live as religieux, or 'friars', all worldly ties put away: a momentous decision, not I hold made during the first year or two, but found necessary when homes were left and touring on alms begun. It shows Dharma not as a code of dogmas, such as 'four truths', or 'eightfold path', or 'links in causation', or 'impermanence, ill, not-soul': nothing of all that. It paraphrases Dharma as perfect conduct, in a word hitherto used for the life of a student under his teacher, resembling to some extent the life of a medieval youth in a collegiate cloister, but now applied to life as the 'manyfolk' might live if they chose to.

And we can, if we avoid the usual inferences drawn from the charge, see how Dharma appears, not as an externalized code of religious doctrine, but as a synonym of living-as-it-ought-to-be. We must cut out the terms 'meaning' and 'letter', where *attha* is used in a different sense from *attha* as 'weal' in the first sentence. Those two belong to a later *literary* stage, and are insertions. We must cease to see in Dharma any reference to an early, middle and later development of doctrine; clearly an equally late and literary idea. Dharma, as a Becoming in life as it should be lived, is bound up with the whole of life, whether we are looking at this one stage only of our earth-lives, *or* at life as a whole, and seeing in the 'end' the close of one stage, *or* that consummation of it which is the more usual meaning of the word here used: *pariyosāna*.

Further than this, the Vinaya fragments are disappointing. They reveal not the spirit of the truth-seeking narrator, but the care of the monk to show

just enough to give a basis of prestige and sacred tradition to the fact of his Order and to its immense code of rules. The living original Man who initiates the movement becomes a very dummy, and no consecutive mandate in his teaching is kept to the front.

If we turn to the Second, the Sutta Pitaka, we find indeed a great mass of discourses or sermons, mixed with not a few interviews—the latter being by far the more informative—nearly all of which appear as sayings of the Founder. This is not because he had not men who were admittedly very able in the little company of about ten who are oftenest named as being with him, but because the Buddha-cult which grew up in the third and fourth centuries after his death made him an all-dominating figure, so that his most gifted disciples usually figure as mere pupils of him. And when they are shown venturing to teach in his absence, an endorsement by the Founder of what they have been saying—especially if they are women—may be held to be called for.

But neither here is there any idea of presenting a consecutive narrative of the mission years, nor of the later years, when the now lonely and ageing Gotama appears to have left the touring to his more vigorous disciples, and to have taken up a permanent residence at the gift house of Jeta Grove, close to the city of Sāvatthī, the capital of the kingdom of Kosala. It is not till we find him, an octogenarian, touring alone with Ānanda, that we get for the first time something like a 'log' of the tour, doubtlessly remembered and orally recorded by Ānanda. Other Suttas often give a place where he is 'staying', before recording some interview or unasked discourse, but these episodes are

quite sporadic, meteoric. All that is evident is (*a*) the new venue :—Rājagaha, Vesālī, &c., revealing a tour ; (*b*) the record in the Vinaya that all touring ceased during the spring weeks of the rains ; and (*c*) the long residence at Sāvatthī betrayed, it may be, by the great preponderance of Suttas assigned to talks at that centre.

As to the matters talked of, there is plenty in these many hundreds of epitomized talks in the Collections, coupled with the few dozens of detailed addresses in the first two Collections, to fill out many tours. This is true even if we discount the great number of the former hundreds, which appear in variant parallels, usually of two, sometimes of more. It is inevitable that a very special mandate bringing a new note into religion should repeat that note times without number, the central theme being presented, not in the same words, but with every variety of application, and with a large number of parables.

But let not the reader get here a false impression. Actually the Suttas are astonishingly poor in such repetitions and in such parables as bring that central theme into relief. The parallels are in most cases concerned with little details of conduct and opinion. The majority of the parables have nothing to do with the central theme, but are so many alarm signals warning of the dangers of life in the world : of man's work and its absorbing interests, of man's love and its penalties, of man's play and its dire results :—all one long monkish wail. And throughout we hear amazingly little of the missioners themselves : of their seeking to help this man and that woman and that child ; of their doing so ; of their thought and their

will and their feelings as they wended and worked. They have become little more than dummies. We would give much in these arid sands of words to come upon such a sentence as that in the Gospels: 'Then Jesus beholding him loved him . . .' or 'O Jerusalem, how oft would I have gathered thee as a hen gathered her chickens and ye would not. . . .' Now and then the Commentaries give us a more human touch. They show us Gotama seeking the little child exposed to wild beasts, and sending the bereaved mother on a mission over which she will lose the self-pity that is strangling her.

For after all no mission worthy the name is a mere matter of ladling out words now here now there. It is the contact of a man of abounding goodwill with the man who may be starving for want of it, both from others and in himself. The deedlessness of the Suttas is a sore defect.

What more have readers found, who may have dived into a volume of translated Suttas such as we have been putting forth nearly every year since the century began? [1]

He may say: Was it really a generation of mission tours to 'the Many-folk' (*bahu-jana*)? What I find in so many cases are talks to monks, not to laymen. The proportion is nearly two to three. And if of the latter we take out all talks which do not bear on the need of bringing the 'God-life' into religion, the remainder, in which this is actually the theme, is very small indeed. This small remainder does indeed show us the missioner seeking to make conduct in this man,

[1] *Pali Text Society's* and *S. Bks. Buddhists* Translations.

that woman, a very becoming in a More, as something more religiously vital than ritual or contemplation. But why are there not more of these?

And he may say: I don't find that stress on the good life called, as you call it, a becoming in the More. When becoming is mentioned, it seems to be in terms of reprobation, of disgust, as a state to be cut out, as a canker, as a link in the heaping up of ill. The Way, too, I find nearly always associated, not with becoming, but with eight kinds of thought, word and deed, which, as eight, leave out wisdom, faith and amity, as if these were not of the Way. I find plenty about change or transience being of necessity a misfortune, but I do not find 'becoming' distinguished as a happy kind of change.

And he may say: The Suttas seem to me to be mainly concerned, not so much with 'the man' as the subject of religion, as with *ideas about the man*, with analyses of ideas good and bad: in short, the kind of topics that preachers would select who had a tradition, a scripture behind them, on which to make sermons under heads. It is rather the talk of pundits or even pedants, than the utterances of missioners.

And he may say: There seems a curious want of agreement in the ideals put forward. *Now* we see the self banished, not only as being neither body nor mind, but as if, given the changing man, there cannot be in him the (unchanging) self; *then* we have a self who is present with the self, watching, 'witnessing', urging, warding, upbraiding, and is the 'bourn of self'. *Now* we see disciples urged to think on the happy progress of devas and to find joy in becoming like them and with them, all purgatorial punishment

made impossible. *Then* we read that the disciple is not to cleave to any world good or bad, but to aspire to a worth of which the result will be a stopping of life in any world whatever.

I would reply to all this : if you see these curious incongruities, these jarring features in the Suttas, you have read more than have most people, and you have read more intelligently than most. To understand the history of these scriptures you must first perceive these oddities. The hoary tradition, still vaguely accepted in Buddhist belief, is, that all these collections :—Vinaya and Sutta Pitakas—were compiled during the lifetime of the Founder, and were recited at the First Council after his death. In this way a very great prestige attached to both. But it is very palpably untrue. There are Suttas in which we read that the Founder had already passed away indefinitely earlier. And this at once opens up the possibility of other inaccuracies in the statement. The Council-record names only four Vinaya Rules, and only two Suttas ; it then adds : 'in like manner did he question him through the Five Nikāyas', viz. the whole Sutta-Pitaka ! Conceivably a higher antiquity may be claimed for those six items, but not for the immense residue in its present form or bulk.

Your next step will be, as a reader of translations, to note carefully the repetition and emphasis given to certain formulated doctrines, and compare with these the, as it were, left-in mention of other points which I have been claiming as originally central. You will come to see that, whereas the latter have nothing to do with the monastic ideals in the former, they are often in keeping with the ideals we find in

the Indian teaching of the Founder's day. And you will conclude that they, the latter, must be the older sayings, since they are being overshadowed by the more emphatic formulated doctrines and could only be 'left-ins', not later importations.

You may then perhaps say: Perhaps the founders planned from the first a twofold institution in religious culture: the one a gospel for the Many appealing to the Many, and one a special discipline and aim for those men, who, whether they were missioners or not, all felt the need of resigning the life of the Many and of following the career we call monastic, or world-forsaking. Will not this account for at least some of the discrepancies?

If you so conclude, you will not be the first to do so. This has been recently done in both Europe and India. My rejoinder is this: The conclusion cannot be right for original Buddhism, else had this never been a world-gospel. This was a mandate for Man, and not in part for a special class of man. Some universal need of humanity, for the ministering to which it is somewhere becoming ready:—this is the keynote of a new world-religion. But out of the birth-gospel, under the pressure of current movements, this or that development may arise. The dual gospel is true enough of Buddhism now, but that is because it has undergone a long, increasingly diverging development, *under the influence*, from the first, of the new monastic vogue, the influence of the study of mind. So also the development, the jarring note, in the references to the 'self' or soul, was a result at once of the new study of mind, coupled with the slowly widening breach between Sakyan and Brahman. As to this,

we see similar widenings between Christian bodies, *e.g.* the Wesleyans or Methodists and the Church of England. Or much earlier between the Catholic Church and the Arians, and later, between it and the Nestorians.

Now the man who left the world was, in India as in Europe, at the centre of the learning of his day. All teaching in religion, as in the general training of mind, was in his hands. Hence that which he held in worth became the chief thing to hold in worth. He moulded the oral body of knowledge ; he moulded later the written body of knowledge. Scripture was not a ' bible ' for every man ; it was the manual of those teachers. Through it they defined chiefly their aims ; through it they taught as they thought fit. And it is not unreasonable that the Sutta homilies should be what they are, namely, guidance for guides, primed with which the younger, or in any case the newer clerics themselves graduated, and instructed the Manyfolk in their own diction, just as any man in holy orders now does in the Christian Church. And when these homilies were as oral compositions fresh, we may assume, that they were not regarded as anything sacrosanct in wording, finally fixed, unalterable. That they came to be so regarded will have happened, as time went on, when the weight of the ' dead hand ' or mortmain lay upon them, and when they were given written fixity.

In a little manual of this kind we can go no further in an examination of Buddhist scriptures. Let the reader who has some acquaintance with them and he who has none listen, while I try to imagine—not to

fancy—what they would hear told them, were one of those first missioners to come among us bringing word of the things they really taught.

" I will tell you that which I remember of our mission in ' Man as Becoming ' when we were working under the leadership of Gotama, long ago in India. Note first that we never spoke about a ' doctrine of ' this or that. We spoke to man about the man, the man as Indian religious teaching was then valuing him. Not as body nor as mind, but as a very self, or as you would say, soul, spirit, as man-in-man, who was in his nature very God. Your Western saints have now and then come to word the man like that, but as a rule the West has fallen short of it. India from the day of the generation before us never fell short, has never fallen short, of that. Man in potency is God ; he need not stop at potency if he but will. It is in him to become God actually. This is a form of what you have called Immanence.

Now this is how we valued the man. But chiefly we were concerned to bring home to man the need there was for him to become that which in potency he is. I was taught in the Brahman schools, and I was specially fortunate in my teacher. His name is in their books. He taught us not just that the very man, the self, is the Highest Self, but that the very man was as man a becoming (*bhavya*) that Self : a more, so to speak, in the Most. Man was as a child who in time will, must, grow into manhood. Man was as a seed, in a soil needing the rain of will to nourish the food that is in his nature.[1] Man was as a

[1] In the Fourth Collection (*Gradual Sayings*), i, III, § 76, Ānanda asks Gotama, what is this ' becoming ' that is spoken of? The

wayfarer bound for a distant goal, but with a long journey before he 'became immortal (*amṛta*)', 'became Brahma'. Other teachers of the school also taught this consummation, but my teacher dwelt more than they on the long becoming. A very guide he was to me—no, he was not what is now a *guru*. He was not both confessor and guide in my career; that sort of man was, with us, in his infancy; he was just teacher. But it was through his teaching that I was drawn to Gotama, when I left the Brahman schools. There was coming over them, ay, even over my own teacher, a faltering in the faith in man's becoming. You have noticed this decline in the Upanishads: this treating becoming as if decay must supervene on it, as if the immaterial immortal man were no other than mortal, than material. Just the same came to pass long after with the Buddhist teaching. The Brahmans fell back on the current high worth they placed in attaining by way of knowing. Man was even here and now the highest Self, did he but know it—and remember, that in that bookless, that unscientific age, with its towering concept of the man, *to know* meant much more than it does for you.

Now we of the Sakyans were not yet faltering in our faith in man as by nature becoming, rather than just being. And this becoming we taught, using the Brahman 'Way' (*marga*), which had replaced the older word *yāna*. We used it as a figure for becoming, for that growth, which the word meant for us. It transformed life into an adventure, an adventure in

reply is that, in becoming, man is as a seed, planted in this or that world, needing for his growth the watering of desire. 'Man' is here called *viññāṇa*. See above, p. 59 f.

the More which man might reach in every lifetime, a wayfaring in the unknown, a reaching forward into the new, the beyond, the further, as we would say. We were the waymen, the waygoers, the 'wellgoers', the waymissioners, the 'true goers'—no, not pilgrims; the pilgrim fares to a known bourn—pioneers were we, explorers. For our way was not of this brief life only. We were in a mandate of the worlds; we lived close to other worlds. We had men who could experience those worlds: such as Moggallāna, Anuruddha, our Leader. They told us what they saw and heard—and we have found that they spoke the truth.

Our teaching was worded very simply and directly. Much as the first 'Christians' told people 'The kingdom of God is within you', or as John the Elder wrote, 'Now are we the sons of God'; so we would say: 'You and I:—we are the very man': *purisa*, *attā*, who is man as the Highest, the Great Self. And we are becoming the More in the Way to that Highest. This we would call *agga*, *parămă*, *uttămă*, *anutt'ără*. We spoke much more of 'a More' than you get in the books. You will often read of becoming, or making *bhiyyo* ('more', the Sanskrit *bhūyas*), but it is no longer used for the very man; always it is something *about him* which is to be a more, so much have the books expelled the man. Yet, both for the books and for us, it was ever by and in his living that the man was bidden become a More; not in his opinions,[1] not in his talking about them, not in ceremonies, but in the degree to which he shaped his conduct ever more and more above that which was for him the average,

[1] Monastic, 'ecclesiastical' Buddhism attached great importance to 'opinion' (*diṭṭhi*).

much more above that which was for him a falling back.

I said ceremonies : but do not mistake me. We had no need to warn 'men of the street' against ritual, for this was outside their life, and was a matter, then, solely for the priest. In our day the Brahmans were the sole men of the rite. The Brahmans were at first quite with us, in our taking their teaching to the people, for they judged we should uphold them. It was when we turned to them, and taught that their sacrifices were unimportant compared with the religious value of conduct, that they held us to be dangerous.

But the laity we found, as it were, waiting for us. The educated among them had been taught the new Immanence, as we had been, but not the belief in man's need to 'become That.' This had been dying out, save in such as had taught me. And it was just this Way of Becoming that we brought to bear on the new and lofty notion of the man, as being the 'more' that they were needing, to 'fulfil' that teaching of Immanence. It was the seeing in life a Way of growth that they welcomed.

That, and also the worth in the inner guide of 'what ought to be', the seeing in 'dharma' the working of the Ideal Self, the value that a man places in choice. It was in choice that a man best showed his becoming. But here we were hampered in the need of the right word. We tried to bring in *vuṇoti*, choosing ; we used 'take hold of' (*gaṇhāti*, *ādiyati*). But the one was rarely used, the others were too general in meaning. It was *vără*, the thing chosen, elect, selected as better, as best, that we insisted on in man's becoming, and

you can see, that through us the word attained a new force it had not before.[1]

Here were words, here were values that all men could understand : so, too, was our insistence on effort, energy, endeavour, initiative. Without the exercise of this there could be no worthy becoming, no self-directed becoming.

But these, one and all of them, *dharma* too and *bhavya*, were substitutes for the great word we then lacked, but which you have : the word 'will'. In that word it is the living, the doing of man that is valued. We tried in our religion much later to make this good ; India much later tried to make this good. We with our new Word had to make shift with the words we found. These were mainly becoming, *dharma*, effort, choice. By these we sought to show man as not only contemplating and knowing, but as also living and doing.

We were the first men to teach the general public in a corporate, organized way, but not otherwise the first. The man who had a new word, a more-word to give out publicly was a very old thing in India. Such an one would speak to or with men in the market, or when resting beneath a tree, or occupied as herdsmen, as woodcutters, as fishermen and the like. It was with us as with him the great will to bring a

[1] *Varo varaññu varado varâharo, anuttaro dhammavaram adesayi.*

Man of the Better, who the Better knew,
Who gave the Better, who the Better brought,
Incomparable, he Dhamma the Better taught.
(*Sutta-Piṭaka, Khuddakapāṭha.*)

message that made us go about. In a way it was easier to talk with men who had been to the Brahman schools, since we brought to such a sequel. But to others, to the woman, the child : here, too, was 'the man', held to be hearer, experiencer, valuer, willer. Our message counted with them too. Nor did they see any 'atheism' in it. It was the seeking the way to a Higher that we taught, and in such a way, the Highest will grow in idea with advance in the way.

Nor as to that had Indian thought, even when uncultured, ever seen Deity as external quite as did the West. This was true even in the Vedas. To say, as do both ignorant and some learned dicta, that Buddhism denies or ignores 'God and the soul', is to use words, having a certain meaning in West and Near-East, for Indian ideas which they do not fit. Deity for India was never wholly external; soul for India was never a 'property' of the man. The many-folk too were closer to the facts of life and death than were often the more educated. For them the question in bereavement was never : Is M. or N. alive, existing, or is he not? The question was only : How, or where is he? It is in the teaching of the schools only that you find the sceptical question put.[1] But we were out to tell of the Way as of the worlds, and we would say, if we were among those who knew, where in the Way was now M. or N.

Women on the whole received us gladly. There was a movement afoot among many of them to win more liberty domestic and social. Now we were not

[1] *E.g. Kaṭha Up.* : '. . . as to one deceased, he exists, say some ; he exists not, say others :—this would I know (O Death !).'

teaching 'liberty' (*mukti, môksha*) ; that was a later move, as has been shown. But they were welcoming the New, the expanding-in-becoming, the growth of the very man. Was not growth in the man ever beneath their eyes and within them? You know how they came to break forth in song about their worth in our teaching. Children could not do the like, but it is not true to say that our arms were shut against the child. He was for us the very type of becoming.

Here, then, was the mandate we took with us on our daily rounds, our longer tours about the Ganges valley. Let me put it into a few words :

'That man, as having the God-nature, was one who to fulfil This needed to become This ; that herein he was to be chooser between this way and that way ; that in choosing, the God-nature was working in him, did he but heed, that so he might be "walking according to *dharma*" ; that the walking was, as it were, in a Way, a Way of Becoming ; not a short Way, but one of worlds, of lives, opportunities each for wayfaring further ; that just ahead of him and indeed around him lay a world of the worthier folk, watching and willing him, commending, blaming ; that in wayfaring it was his relations in conduct to the fellowman, also of Godhead in nature, which would count in that becoming, in that fellowship hereafter. A very gospel of hope and joy in the way of attaining that "suchness"[1] that came within near reach as we wayfared further.' "

---

[1] In a much-overlooked Sutta (Second Collection, No. 68) Gotama is recorded as asking some of his worthier disciples whether they were not delighting in the 'God-life'? Anuruddha, on their behalf, admits they are. Gotama goes on : 'With what aim do I tell you the fate of this and that one of us who has passed away? Was it to cajole or delude you, or to advertise myself? It was not. It was, that hearing, you might be glad to think you also could attain to a "suchness" as is theirs.'

CHAPTER VIII

BUDDHISM AND FOREIGN MISSIONS

TO Buddhism is given the credit, by one writer after another, of being a missionary religion in the fullest sense in which we use the term. Yet is there no statement about it that needs more careful revision, more drastic pruning than just this. Certainly the movement began as the work of men whom we now would call 'missioners'. Certainly the further organizing of mission work in touring, not very long after the start, is one of the clearest items in the records. That the tours were carried on in the 'Middle Country' is attested by Sutta episodes and by Vinaya rules. That missionary tours within India far to the north and west, and perhaps east, of the Ganges valley were undertaken during the reign of King Asoka is attested *only* in the Ceylon chronicles many centuries later, but the names of men who led these missions have been discovered in recent excavations.[1] That a mission tour of a quite specific monastic stamp was conducted in Ceylon for a brief period by one Mahendra (Pali : Mahinda), said to be either the half-brother or the son of King Asoka, is also attested by the Chronicles. But this appears to have been less a genuine mission tour, than what we might call a Revivalist campaign, its object being not to raise

[1] Rhys Davids, *Buddhist India*, p. 299 f. ; (my) *Manual*, p. 317.

the spiritual Becoming of the islanders, but to induce men and women indiscriminately to become monks and nuns. That the earlier gospel of the Sakyans had already been carried to South India, and thence across to the island, is preserved in a tradition which alleges that both Gotama and three of his predecessors had each in his lifetime visited Ceylon. Mahendra's mission would have most seriously disorganized the island had it lasted longer, but he does not appear to have lived long. The social cleavage of Ceylon into two classes, lay and monastic, is the questionable benefit he left behind him. That Gotama himself visited Ceylon is pure myth.

Now this is all that can be placed to the credit of a corporate Buddhism in mission work of a genuinely initiative character (and Mahendra's mission had not even that). It is impossible to show that any such mission work was carried out by Asoka himself either within or outside his dominions. It is impossible to show that the men who appear in the earliest Chinese reference to Buddhism, namely, about 217 B.C., came as missionary emissaries from a central church or Sangha in India or elsewhere. Let me as briefly as possible try to correct this error of too long standing.

The fallacy that Asoka sent 'missions' to foreign countries rests on a passage in one of the rock-carved Edicts, which are to be seen in India. This Edict is on three rock-slabs, known as 'Shahbazgarhi, XIII' (N.E. of Peshawar), 'Mansehra, XIII' (in the Panjab) and 'Kalsi, XIII' (near Mussoorie). In these he announces that he has 'won conquest by *dharma*' (not as in former years by war) 'both here and among all borderers, even to where reign' four kings :—in the

names we recognize, spelt otherwise, as Antiochus, Ptolemy, Antigonus, Magas and Alexander, rulers in the remains of Alexander the Great's empire—and southwards to the kingdom of the Chodas and Pandyas, as far as Tamraparṇi. (These were all in Southern India, but the last may be either Indian or Ceylon itself.) He goes on : 'Even those to whom the envoys (*dūtā*) do not go, having heard of *dharma*, are conforming to it.'

This is all. It will be seen that no mention is made of the *kind* of men who were victorious *dharma*-conquerors, save only by what is *implied* afterwards in the word *dūtā* : 'victories won where these did not go'. Now it is most improbable that a king, who refers explicitly, in his 'edicts', to 'Brahmans and monks', should, in an undertaking so novel at that time, have termed religious missionaries just 'messengers', 'envoys'. It is very probable, on the other hand, that as a successful man of a new dynasty, a man somewhat in the position of a Tudor or a Hanoverian king, he should announce his entry into the equally new comity of rulers on his western, recently aggressive borders *by a number of embassies*, taking greetings and gifts to show goodwill. But as a consequence of Western writers misunderstanding the Indian, the early Buddhist meaning of the word Dharma, this has been taken to mean 'doctrinal religion', and hence a peculiarly missionary-value has by us been associated with the compound '*dharma*-conquest'. The chief translators of the Edicts : Senart and Hultzsch, betray this difficulty, the one rendering Dharma as 'religion', the other as 'morality'.

Has Asoka himself anything to say about the term ?

Yes ; he asks in one of the Pillar Edicts (No. II) : 'Dharma is excellent ; now of how many kinds (*kati*) is Dharma? Few evil tendencies, many virtuous (things or deeds), kindness, giving, truth, purity.' And he is often enjoining the 'walking according to, or by Dharma'. But there is nothing here of a doctrine or cult, much less a 'church', which would require men 'in orders' to propagate it, or establish with it any external building and ritual, such as we now understand as going, even if it be of the simplest kind, with missionary campaigning.

It may be asked : Is there any response to those visits of Asoka's 'envoys' traceable in such history as exists about Alexander's successors? There is no record whatever of the arrival of any religious missions. And the only records of envoys sent to the court of the Mauryans are those of men sent as purely political ambassadors by rulers of the Greek provinces of North-Western India before and after the reign of Asoka, but not unfortunately during that interval. Such was Megasthenes, who was at Patna in the reign of Asoka's father, and whose memoirs *Ta Indika* have survived. He has nothing to say of Indian religious teachers save about 'Brahmanoi and Sarmanoi'.

The other writer, Alexander Polyhistor, dates as late as about 60 B.C., and had something to say about Buddhist monks, a passage which has only survived as quoted by Porphyry.

There has survived, however, one other passage, and one only, which is for me very suggestive. The chronicler is Hegesandros. He makes Asoka's father King Bindusāra send an envoy to his Greek neighbour's son, Antiochus, ruler in North-West India, asking for

a consignment of Greek fruit and wine *and of a teacher* of Greek learning (*sophistes*).[1] Fruit and wine were dispatched, with the reply, that the Greek did not trade in human flesh. It is fairly obvious that, if Bindusāra had asked for that learning in written form —in books, we should say—there would have been no difficulty. But for India of that time written compositions were non-existent; and teaching had to be carried out by the living book, the speaker. Either this had not dawned upon Antiochus or Bindusāra, or perhaps no Greek was sufficiently enterprising to come to India, learn a current cultured vernacular and then by it teach the 'Wisdom of the West'.

But that Bindusāra saw nothing out of the way in the request betrays *a new departure in trade*, which may then have been already growing with the advance in commerce by both sea and land. Cultured men of any older civilization might be desirous of learning to know a Wisdom of the West, a Wisdom of the East, no less than Rome was soon to be seeking to import the 'Art of Greece' in statue and fresco. These would charter a merchant taking wares abroad to engage at their cost a 'sophist', from a land of reputed culture, to be brought to them, who would then be set to learn their tongue, teach, it may be, his own, and then teach his native 'learning' in the tongue he had learnt. Asoka may very well have encouraged this trade in live books, as tending to spread respect for a way of life based on heeding that *dharma* which, as he wrote, made for morality (*sīla*).

In this or these ways then, and in these only, may we see in Asoka's régime anything approaching a

[1] The passage also survives only in a quotation.

missionary interest. That he sent anywhere beyond his borders (with the possible exception of Ceylon) anything in the nature of a company of monks and doctrines, ready-made in everything except the knowledge of the tongue in which they could make their teaching understood, is for me so improbable as to be grotesque, unless there were any evidence to show us that the missionaries could count on the patronage of the ruler of the country so visited.

But perhaps the chief disclaimer in the mission-credit attached to Buddhism is the Buddhist literature itself. The European writers who put in the claim were not familiar enough with that literature to discern this. I am not familiar with the whole of that literature, but I have gone some way, and for me, the silence, the apathy about foreign propagation of 'dhamma' is very striking. It does not seem to come within the thoughts or the desires of the compilers of a single Pali work, canonical or post-canonical. I do not remember any reference to missions in prose Sutta or in the Anthologies; nor in the many subjects debated in the one book of Abhidhamma which has a wide range of subjects,[1] much less in the rest. The Commentaries, so far as I have gone into them, tell me nothing either. More noticeable is the silence in the less exegetical treatises of the fifth-century writers: Buddhadatta, Buddhaghosa. The famous *Path of Purity* of the latter reveals no interest in the matter whatever.

It is not till we come to the Ceylon Chronicles that we find appreciation of mission-work. They show us, not *dūta's*, but *thera's* or senior monks going

[1] Kathāvatthu debates.

on a mission in Asoka's reign. But only to the Northern confines of India, including the Greek provinces: the Yonaka-loka, or Ionic world of North-West India. In these Asoka is not shown taking any interest. Yet it is probable he would have done so in his Edicts, had he been the 'Constantine' he is usually made out to have been. On the other hand, how greatly would he have been acclaimed by Buddhist religieux and laymen, had he indeed taken in hand the dispatch and protection of foreign missions! The silence on the one side and the other reveals something amiss in the conclusions of European writers, and of Buddhists, who for that matter had been, if I err not, silent about these early 'missions' till we misinformed them.

It will only seem strange, that there should be this indifference in the literature as to missions abroad, in a religious movement which began with such a clear call to mission work, *if we forget* how greatly that movement had changed in its whole conception about the man. But let us keep here to external events, whereby that change is betrayed.

Of the Four Buddhist Councils, or Conferences which took place in India, the First, at Rājagaha, was convened on the death of the Founder; not to appoint a successor—this would have been contrary to his wish; Dharma was to be each man's Guide—but to endorse such Rules and Fixed Discourses as were yet drawn up by the Order. The Second, at Vesālī, was technically to rule out ten 'indulgences', all, with exception of the last, of a petty kind, but virtually to suppress a movement in favour of decentralization. The Fourth, which took place in Kashmere, in the first century A.D., was the accomplishing of a revised

canonical written scripture, engraved, it is said, in the Tibetan records—we have no other—on many tables of stone.

The Third Council is said to have taken place at Patna, during the reign of Asoka, eighteen years after his accession, and to have lasted seven months. The date is probably too soon in that reign ; the duration is probably too short, for the revision and standardization of Sayings (not writings), repeated, as at a sort of Eisteddfod, by professional, *i.e.* monk repeaters from various centres, was a tremendous undertaking. The Pali accounts of it are in two Commentaries and the Ceylon Chronicles ; not contemporary records, but dating, in their present form, from centuries later. Other records omit it, seeing the Fourth Council as the Third. I am not therefore disposed to see the Patna Council as either fictitious, or as a mere sectional meeting.[1] The account the Pali books give of the Buddhist 'church' in India of Asoka's day is of a state so corrupt, that we might rather look to find that Church suppressing or minimizing the Council than inventing it. That other records do not refer to it may well be due to the degradation inflicted upon the men of the dissentients, whence these records sprang, the men, it may be, who eventually took their teaching into Central and Eastern Asia.

Asoka followed no special cult. It was of importance to secure his patronage. But the vigorous and growing cult of the 'Sakyans' had come, in the absence of a strong ecclesiastical hierarchy, to include very mixed tenets and an obtrusive rabble of unordained monks, eager only to live on the dole of alms. It

[1] So T. Kern, *Indian Buddhism.*

was decided to commence a great purge, both in monastic membership and in doctrine. The unordained were sifted out and expelled. The records confuse with this purge, that of a great number of genuine monks, whose views were not in keeping with those of the appointed revisionist committee, and place the revision of the mass of Sayings last. But since it was surely necessary to have the Sayings revised first and pronounced as 'authentic', *i.e.* approved by the representatives of the majority in the Sangha, it seems more than probable, that the expulsion of genuine, but dissentient monks took place last, after the great work of revisional editing had been accomplished.

Very brief, very unsatisfying is the chronicle of this momentous procedure. But we are, in that scanty record, in a different world from that of the movement when young. The criterion of orthodoxy is made that of being a Distinguisher or Analyser: Vibhajjavādin (*bhajj*—is breaking up, examining in detail). The Sammā-sambuddha (rightly enlightened one) is said to have been such. Hence every monk must be acknowledged to be such. Else he must leave the Order. In this way it is recorded that no less than 60,000 ordained monks were ejected, and, it is added, presented with the white raiment, namely of the layman. This number in the record was one-hundredth of the total number attending the Conference. The proportion alone has any validity; in Pali literature a thousand is no more exact than our 'a thousand thanks', and simply means a considerable number, just as 'five hundred monks' means a good many. The number 'six' is less easily accounted for. I sug-

gest that, since we find six monastic centres appearing in Suttas beginning in a distinctive way, which may betoken a school for the collection and handing on by repetition of Suttas, the Conference was made up of monks from these six centres, their presence being imperative as so many living 'versions' of the Sayings, which needed standardizing.

As to the curious term Vibhajja-vādin, it is true, that in the Suttas we find Gotama demurring to endorse by a Yea or Nay some shallow generalization, and that, in one, we find him made to distinguish himself on one subject as a 'vibhajja-vādin', not as an 'ekaṃsa-vādin' (generalizer). But nowhere do we find such discretion enjoined on monk or layman, great as is the number and variety of injunctions. And we have to conclude, that this label for orthodoxy was something which had only come into use, either at, or recently before the Conference itself, and which ceased when its members remained as 'The Sangha'.

The important thing for us is to detect *why it should mean orthodoxy*. The clue lies in the first part of a Collection of Debates in the Third Pitaka, which we have translated as *Points of Controversy*. These are said to have been spoken before this very Council at Patna. The President of the Council, Tissa, son of Moggalī, is accredited with the editing of them. The first book contains a long debate, in many sections, on the Man; the last half of it contains debates on Continuity of Being. Now the Debates on the Man actually reveal what it was that the Vibhajja-vādins stood for, and what they, as in the new majority, were driving out from the teaching.

First, the Man is no longer called *purisa* or *attan*

(*homo* or self). He is called *puggălă*, just 'male', fellow, wight or churl. We are thus driven to see the will to derogate from the lofty meaning of old attached to *purisa*, *attan*. In these the man meant Soul, Spirit, Deity immanent. We cannot easily reproduce this difference, and the reader of translations is accordingly misled.

Secondly, the apologist for the Man—he is said to have been from Vesālī—in his contention, that the Man is a most real being, and was, as such, taught by the 'Blessed One', is opposed by this :—that all that we can ultimately distinguish under the word 'man' are so many appearances or states or things (*dhamma's*), bodily and mental.

Here then we see the strange ruin into which the mandate of Gotama three hundred years old had evolved. For consider! The Man or Self of the teaching he had sought to expand : the God-in-Man, is, as spiritual, unanalysable, not to be worthed in parts as if he were body and mind. But the Vibhajja-vādins sought to analyse him, seeing in him only a complex, falling into the very snare against which Gotama is shown warning his first disciples. Broken up into the component parts of what are only his tools, body and ways of mind, this lower view of the man is made impressive by the relatively base term *puggala*.

The debates numbered 6, 7, 8, also betray, though not so obviously, the ruin wrought in the original teaching. The defenders in these debates were known as 'Everything-is'-theorists. Their contention was, that in the constant change in everything, the very being, whether material or spiritual, did not cease ; it went on becoming. In things of matter the sub-

stance, if inanimate, might be refashioned, as *e.g.* a gold jar, melted down and remade. If it were, say, a woman, there was the twofold becoming: the girl, both body and soul, would one day be called woman, mother. Her *being* had not ceased. We do not see the connexion between being and becoming till we turn to these sayings of the teachers quoted in the Tibetan scriptures, as Sarvâstivādins named Dharmatrāta, Ghosăka, Buddhadeva. When we compare these with the Debates, we discern what it was in the defenders to which offence was taken; we discern that at the hands of Tissa there has been much editing; we discern that in the title Everything is, we should read Everything becomes: *Sarva-bhavati.* In the Suttas we find the Founder made to say: Not:— 'Everything is'; not 'Everything is not'; but 'Everything is becoming'. But the last clause has been smothered in that formula about causation, in which Becoming is but one link, albeit the whole chain is a Becoming. The other name, by the way, that the defendants came to be known by was Hetu-vādin, or Cause-theorists.

There has been much obliquity and muddle in the (oral) editing of these Debates. I do not pretend to be clearing up the problem. There is, for instance, a passage in the First Debate which belongs to the Sarvâsti-vādin Debate, and has lost its way. How, it is asked, does Man survive? 'By Becoming' is the reply. And then the opponent asks whether everything which becomes does not also decay: a question reasonable only, if body and mind be taken to constitute the whole man. The Defender probably retorted thus; if so, it has been carefully omitted.

It was men like these whom the New Majority saw fit to disgrace by expulsion. The loss to the central 'church' was fearful, a loss even heavier than was incurred in the Catholic Church 350 years ago by the expulsion of the Huguenots, or over a thousand years ago at the Council of Ephesus by the expulsion of the great missionary body known as the Nestorians. For it was virtually a rejection, an expulsion of the Man who had turned to look his last at Vesālī, the faithful city. That the man is most real, Divine in nature, becoming little by little actual, not potential only, in Godhead :—this expulsion it was that had preceded the expulsions, at Patna, of the Minority who still so believed.

And with the belief in the Man went also the faith in the benefit, in the duty of taking that belief far and near in missions. Why seek to benefit a man who is but a transient complex of ways of body and mind? Let those who saw in him but this transiency, concentrate in self-culture on 'the way out' of it all. Better the consummation of the few who knew aright than to worry over the Many who knew all amiss :—so the majority will have held.

But the hundreds (to take a more probable figure) who were expelled would not have this motive deterring them from a will to take abroad their religion. And then there was this new opening for it by way of the trade in the 'live book'. Disgraced at home, unshaken, it might be, in the truth of their view, they would here find an opening both in livelihood, in adventure, in a new start in life, and last, perhaps not least, in opportunity for teaching. Rightly or wrongly, it is these, the 'Nestorians' so to speak of Buddhism,

whom I see as arriving in China in 217 B.C. as living books, there to learn a new tongue, there to clothe in it the Wisdom of Gotama, at least as they understood it, there to lay the foundations of that form of Buddhism, so different from that which went south to Ceylon and Burma, so comparatively large-hearted, so believing in the Man's persistence and greater becoming as Man, which we call now Mahāyāna Buddhism.

We have it on Professor Anesaki's authority, that in this year eighteen Buddhist monks are recorded as having come to China, but that in 2 B.C. certain, Chinese ambassadors brought back some Buddhist scriptures to their country. These dates are significant. The former, assuming that the expulsions took place at about the end of Asoka's reign (230 B.C.), allow a reasonable interval, both for a decision to enter the living book trade to be made, and for the very lengthy journey, by land or by sea, to have been accomplished. (I place the Patna Council late, because it finds no mention in the Edicts on rock or pillar.) The latter date indicates not only that book writing had been adopted in India—and it is evidently a new event in the work Questions of Milinda, date *cc.* 80 B.C. —but that Indian books, or for that matter Ceylon books, were finding their way by trade or otherwise to the far East.

Those eighteen men are called 'monks'. This would seem to show, that even if we credit the story, probably a myth, of the gift of the white robes, they had resumed their yellow robes—and very battered these must have become! There being none of the genus 'monk' in China, they will have perhaps been

classed as priests. That they did not remain merely tutors in an alien ' lore ', an exoteric object of cultured curiosity, appears from their acceptance as founders of a new faith.

It is not easy to explain this acceptance in a country where in religion, not the man, much less the monastic corporation was the unit, but the family. I do not find this has been adequately explained. It cannot be, so long as we see, in those eighteen missionaries, champions of monasticism, on the one hand, and of the lowered estimate of the man, as a mere transient complex, on the other. But *as exponents of the Purisa-vāda* of Vesālī, in which the Man was still taught, as the Founders of Buddhism had taught, namely, as most real, as persisting now and hereafter, the while he was becoming a More in the Way to a Most, they were presenting a very lofty inspiring ideal of manhood. And it may quite possibly be, that this ideal found favour with an advanced wing in Chinese culture, for whom the religious unit of the family, in which the Man was merged, was being felt to be unworthy, and who were ready for the new ideal. In other words, I can see a new creed having the Man-in-Godhead as mandate succeeding, where a new creed having the monk-ideal as mandate could not succeed.

Out of this Purisa-vāda creed I can imagine the evolution of Chinese Buddhism as that which came later to be distinguished as Mahāyāna, or the Great Way. (As to Way, it is true that by the ambiguity of the word *yāna*, which came to mean rather ' means of wayfaring ' than ' way ', and through a famous parable used in a Mahāyānist text, ' yāna ' has come

to stand for 'vehicle',[1] but its classic Indian meaning, preceding the use of 'marga' was always 'way': way into the hereafter, Deva-yāna, Piṭr-yāna.) I imagine, nay, I reason it out in this way: The Mahāyānist ideal differs from that of the intermediate Buddhism stigmatized by it as Hīna-yāna (low vehicle) thus: Man in it is not bidden to aspire to consummation as man in *arahatta*, *i.e.* in saintship, which might be realized in earthly life, and beyond which no existence as 'man' was conceived. He aspires to a persistence hereafter in a higher stage, known as that of *bodhisattva*, or enlightenment, and to consummation beyond that as Buddha, or supreme Divinity. But out of great compassion he wills arrest in the former stage, so that, as yet embodied, if glorified man, he may be still in a position to will help to men in lower worlds.

Now if we have been able to distinguish the Hīnayāna ideal given above as *not that of original Buddhism*, we are in a position to see, that in Mahāyāna-Buddhism we have nothing that disagrees[2] with the teaching of Gotama, in his expansion of Indian Immanence; we have only an added item of faith in the self-retarding of the Bodhisattva, an item which is not out of harmony with the compassion for all creatures so much associated in tradition with his teaching. The mistake made by Mahāyānists is *to see, in 'Hīnayāna', the original teaching of Gotama*. Their 'Hīnayānism' is really the monastic distortion of that teaching, which I have called above 'intermediate Buddhism'.

[1] *Saddharma-puṇḍarīka*, S.B.E., XLIV.

[2] This is not to say we may not find Hīnayānist errors, such as *anattā* in Mahāyāna, but they may well be later importations.

But in the tradition which they hold as to the tie between them and the Founders of Buddhism we can see how they feel after what is really historic truth. This tradition is, that Gotama became inspired with both a gospel about things as they appear and also an ultimate gospel about things as they really are; that he hesitated as to teaching the latter, his land and time not being ready for it, and taught only the former, in the 'truths about Ill' and a threefold slogan about transience, ill and not self; that he confided the latter mandate to Sāriputta to be handed on as *guhyavyakta*: occult or esoteric, till the right conjuncture should arrive. Here we have in so many words the error of which I speak. The later monastic formulas of the 'truths' and the threefold 'mark' of things are *imagined to be original Buddhism*, no less than the far loftier nature and destiny of man, which, in a distinctive guise, has evolved in China. And Gotama is represented as hesitating about teaching a philosophic doctrine of the nature of things. It is forgotten, or not known, how he is, according to earlier records said to have hesitated, whether a monastic gospel and one about causality spiritually applied would be a teaching palatable to the Many, and to have rejected such a mandate, not postponed its utterance.

But I believe that Mahāyānists are right in fastening on the section among Buddhists called Mahāsanghikas, or 'men of the great company', as founders of Mahāyāna. These were none other than those Defenders of the Man, proceeding from the Vesālī centre, whom we find opposing the Vibhajja-vādins at the Patna Council, and by these dismissed from the Order. Here, and not in any theory of an esoteric doctrine, unworthy

of a world-helper, and said to have been specially and emphatically repudiated by Gotama before his death, may we find the real descent of Mahāyāna.

Hīnayānists have also their way of explanation by way of a twofold teaching, 'popular' (*sammuti*) and 'philosophical', or of 'ultimate truth' (*paramattha-sacca*), and claim that 'the Buddha' taught now by the one now by the other. They thus try to account for his bringing in the man as agent, as mind-controller, as valuer, when speaking to the Manyfolk, and disallowing the reality of the man as all these when tutoring the 'awakened' student. This theory is as unworthy of him and as ill-based as is the other. It never came to be mentioned as theory, until the era of scholastic exegesis dawned, and with it the absolute denial of man's real existence, after those first Debates had been put into fixed form. That theory would have been invaluable to the Vibhajjā-vādin in those debates. *It is never mentioned.*

When Mahayānists of the Far East have set themselves, after my day, to study thoroughly the infancy of their great religion, and have learnt to distinguish between (*a*) Hīnayāna and (*b*) what was really taught in that infancy, there will be no need for any exoteric-esoteric distinction. They will have discovered the true line of heritage from the Founder to their own creed.

But what, it may be asked, of the other chief victims of a shrivelled orthodoxy: the Sarvâsti-vādins? These are also, like the Purisa-vādins, *i.e.* the Mahāsanghikas, classed as Hīnayāna, and were yet so vitally at odds with the so-called parent stem of the 'Thera-vāda, or Vibhajjā-vādins, as to incur expulsion!

Were they equally active in missionary enterprise, whether this was by way of trade or otherwise?

Our main guide in this difficult problem is in the diaries kept by certain 'pilgrims', as they are usually called, that is, scholarly men of China who, some four or five centuries after those eighteen men had arrived in that country, began to make the long journey by land and by sea to visit the motherland of the religion they had adopted. The first we hear of was the monk Fā-Hien, of either the fourth or the fifth century A.D. His object was not professedly that of a pilgrimage. 'Deploring the mutilated . . . state of the collection of the books of discipline (the Vinaya Pitaka)', we read, he arranged with four others to 'go to India and seek for the Disciplinary Rules' in a written form. Now Fā-hien records that in Tibet, in Afghan, he came across monasteries, containing each a few thousand monks, 'all students of the Hīnayāna'. He does not specify further whether these were of this or that sect: orthodox or dissentient. He only tells us, that when he at length secured a written copy of the Vinaya, it was one *as used by the Mahāsanghikas.*

Three or four centuries later the better-known traveller Hsüan-Tsang made a similar campaign, mainly to confer with learned Indian colleagues. He also came across monasteries on his way and these were mainly of the Sarvâsti-vādins. Hence it is possible that Fā-hien's Hīnayānists were of this school. He also mentions visiting monasteries in India belonging to them. We can see, then, that the Patna dissentients survived their disgrace in India, and established their own special cult in their own land, as dissentients have done in other creeds. I may

mention, that the Sarvâsti-vādins settled mainly in Kashmere. We see also that this school must have carried their religion beyond India north and north-east, and we find them also along the south-eastern seaboard of Asia. They would have had the motive for missionizing that the Mahāsanghikas had. They believed in becoming, that is, in the real man as becoming. If I do not see in them the forerunners of Mahāyānism, it is because I incline to think they, in their insistence on continuity of being, lapsed from faith in Becoming on to the current notion of corrupt Buddhism, that man just changed, rather than that, in changing, he became, if he willed, more than he was. The 'momentary man', to use a phrase of an English thinker, got a strong grip on Buddhist thought, sorely worsening the original teaching.

Nevertheless, it is these men, and not 'Theravādins', that we find bearing their religion overland and sea, just as it is in the teaching of the Defenders of the Man, whether we call them that, or Mahāsanghikas, or Vajjians, that we can alone account for the specific development taken by Buddhism in China, and thence to Mongolia, thence to Japan.

To record even in outline the later history of Buddhism would require another volume; moreover, I lack acquaintance at first hand with countries calling themselves partly, or wholly, Buddhist. Even in the early history of Buddhism in the East of Asia, it is yet impossible fully to apply research in historic criticism. There has been no such Society systematically opening up the existing literature dealing with what we call Mahayanist Buddhism for some fifty years,

as we have in the Pali Text Society. There has so far been but one such man as the Founder of that undertaking. The work of making accessible to us the oldest Chinese works about Buddhism has been begun. A later generation will discuss it historically.

EPILOGUE

ERRORS have a way of living long. Misunderstandings easily take birth, but are hard to kill. Let me leave the reader in no misunderstanding as to this one thing—This little book will *not* serve as a summary of what books about Buddhism by other writers contain. The reader who, having acquaintance with some of these books, whether in English or other tongues, seeks in this work a handy pocket-edition condensing their contents will be disappointed. Its pages bid him begin again from the beginning and come to other conclusions than those in those contents. The reader who has no previous acquaintance with Buddhism may deem himself cruising in stiller water. He has not to start afresh. He will have here found a sketch of a world-religion which is not based on the formulas of a creed, formulas elaborated during a period of ecclesiastical hardening and contraction in outlook, formulas which see the nature of man, the life of man, the destiny of man, as a Less, as bound after a brief florescence of 'worthiness', to wane out as man, formulas which thrust aside an indefinite growth of man as man in a More.

The books which give a view of Buddhism based on the formulas maintain that these formulas, as things repeated often in the scriptures, must, because they are repeated, be more true than other sayings of those

scriptures, of which there is no repetition. I would maintain, on the contrary, that much repetition is no guarantee either of truth or of importance. The statements we make most often to each other are of practically no importance and may not be true. Remarks on the weather are but the 'patter' in human intercourse, and are, if true, of very relative truth and of a very localized truth. Yet this faith in certain sayings as being valid and historically vital in a creed, just because they recur often, has been the criterion chosen by pioneer writers on Buddhism, and by many writers even to-day, who openly acquiesce in that criterion.

Those formulas profess to rate the nature of man as not Godhead in potency and becoming, but as a Less in permanence, in health, in reality. 'Everything is this threefold less.' Man is this.

Those formulas show, not the man in a More as being in himself a generating cause, indefinitely creative as such, but that wisdom lies in stopping cause in order to stop effect. The opposite to this is nowhere enjoined.

Those formulas on the saint show a superior wisdom in leaving the world, in becoming that man-in-the-Less, a monk. And they show him, not as having taken a leap forward in becoming a More, but as being finished, as having done, as being at the end, as ready to 'wane out', as seeing consummation in 'the void', as 'man', yet as such not real, not persistent.

Those formulas are the Four Truths, the Way as an 'eightfold path', the emergence of Ill in man's nature and life in a 'Causal Series', the threefold 'Marks' of impermanence, ill and no-self, Release as an ideal,

the Waning-out, or Nirvana of men in the hereafter (which includes the formulas of saintship won). They are here put on one side as decadent elaborations built over and burying the original teaching by a church grown wholly monastic. I hold they are, for all the repetition of them, to be put thus on one side for this reason: in a world-religion, the true mandate, the divinely inspired gospel brings a New Word to man of his becoming, not a Less, but a More. And this More implies and enjoins a faith, that in this More he is advancing towards the ultimate attainment of a Most, a Highest, a Best. But those much-repeated formulas take not this adolescent Man as their central subject; they take Ill as the centre; not man but ill it is that becomes. No saying in the scriptures has been more endorsed by the monk than these originally obscure verses by a nun:

'Being!' Why dost thou harp upon that word?
This a mere bundle of formations is.
'Tis simply Ill that riseth, simply Ill
That doth persist, and then fadeth away.
Nought beside Ill it is that doth become,
Nought else but Ill it is doth pass away.

(*Saṃyutta-Nikāya*, Bk. IV.)

Here you have the things repeated. Here you have the world of the Less. Here you have the Not-True.

But not here only lies error. In the application of ideas that are modern to explain old doctrines, made by those whose acquaintance with the scriptures containing these is but slight, we find errors growing up. Thus we find it said, that the deeds of a man live on in some way apart from the where and when of their doing, and automatically decide the kind of life he

enters upon at death. This curious and irrational assigning the results of a physical 'force' to the meaning of the word *karma* is in contradiction to the scriptural record of the tribunal at death, where the man is judged by his fellows after death in consequence of the way in which his acts have been watched and rated.

Here you have again the world of the Less: The deeds become responsible and not the doer; the deeds judge, and not the fellowman. The result is seen in the lack of vital interest shown by South Asian Buddhists in the Way as binding together the worlds; for them, the earth is detached from these: a tragic contrast with what we read about the Founder and his disciples.

The real Helper, the man whose inspiration comes from inspired messengers, brings to man a new More than he has as yet seen or willed, a new Better in which to become, a new glory in the Beyond. One day men will come to see that this More, this Better lies not in these formulas, nor in interpreting the old by the new. Not so easily is it found. It has to be fitted into its age. It has to be dug up, uncovered, found as 'left in', but as showing a quickening, a fulfilling, an expansion in the New, the Better, which had gone before. This is true of the original message of the Sons of the Sakyas which this book has sought to make a little more clear.

INDEX